

THE SEMANTICS OF REFORMATION: DISCOURSES OF RELIGIOUS CHANGE IN
ENGLAND, C. 1414 – 1688

By

[Copyright 2016]

Benjamin Michael Guyer

Submitted to the graduate degree program in History and the Graduate Faculty of the University
of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chairperson: Jonathan Clark

Luis Corteguera

Katherine Clark

Steven Epstein

Geraldo Sousa

Date Defended: March 07, 2016

The Dissertation Committee for Benjamin Michael Guyer
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

THE SEMANTICS OF REFORMATION: DISCOURSES OF RELIGIOUS CHANGE IN
ENGLAND, C. 1414 – 1688

Chairperson: Jonathan Clark

Date approved: March 07, 2016

Abstract

The Semantics of Reformation: Discourses of Religious Change in England, c. 1414 – 1688

examines how the events of the sixteenth century were conceptualized as the English Reformation. The word ‘reformation’ was widely used during these centuries, but its meaning changed in significant ways. By adopting a linguistic methodology, the dissertation studies reformation as a concept in motion; consequently, the English Reformation, a term widely used today, is treated not as an analytic category but as a historiographical label that developed contingently. The chapters fall into three roughly equal sections, each of which covers a distinct discourse of reformation. Chapters one and two cover the first discourse, which identified reformation as the work of a church council. This discourse began at the Council of Constance (1414 – 1418) and remained firmly in place in all Christian localities through the mid-sixteenth century, when it was challenged by a new discourse: reformation by armed resistance, which is introduced at the end of chapter two and discussed in chapters three and four. The Anglo-Scots reformer John Knox brought this discourse to England’s doorstep through his work *The History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*, which discussed how Knox and his associates pursued a program of religious revolution in mid-sixteenth century Scotland. With Scotland’s church reformed by force, English theological debates about reformation sometimes carried revolutionary implications. When civil war engulfed the entire British Isles in the 1640s, England saw its own reformation by armed resistance. The final two chapters study how Anglican apologists developed a third discourse of reformation in the 1650s. After the regicide of Charles I in 1649 and the ensuing political oppression, Anglican apologists claimed that Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth I brought about the English Reformation. They argued that unlike the Scottish Reformation and the reformations of mid-seventeenth century England,

both of which were accomplished by force, Tudor sovereigns accomplished the English Reformation by law. With the restoration of the monarchy and the Church of England in 1660, this apologetic vision became the standard historical assumption in English society.

Acknowledgements

In piam memoriam

Matthew Christopher Guyer

July 12, 1984 – March 05, 2015

Frater et Miles

A dissertation takes many years, and in that time I have become indebted to many people. I would like to thank my committee members, Luis Corteguera, Katherine Clark, Steven Epstein, and Geraldo Sousa. I am especially grateful to my advisor and chair, Jonathan Clark. Antha Cotten-Spreckelmeyer and the Department of Humanities gave me the opportunity to present the Distinguished Graduate Teaching Assistant Lecture in 2015; the revisions and additional writing made during the last year of research are in many ways due to the perspective gained in preparing that presentation. For this, I am also thankful. Conversations with colleagues have been no less beneficial, and I have learned much from David Scott Gehring, Benjamin T. G. Mayes, W. Brown Patterson, Richard Rex, Keith Stanglin, Marjorie Swann, and Darrick Taylor. I thank Kathy Porsch for giving me time off from work when it was much needed. Throughout my time at KU, I have loved teaching. I thank my students for the many rich memories that they have given me. My family, and especially my parents, have been consistently supportive and understanding, particularly in the last months of the writing process. I am above all indebted to my wife Rachel, with whom life is such joy, and for whom there is no debt.

Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 1
Chapter One The Body Broken: Conciliar Reformation and Ecclesial Division	p. 28
Chapter Two Heads or Members? Bodies in Conflict	p. 75
Chapter Three Dangerous Positions: Debating Reformation in Elizabethan England	p. 126
Chapter Four Angel or Devil: Royal Reformation and its Opponents	p. 186
Chapter Five 'These Times of Reformation': Discourses of Reformation in the 1650s	p. 250
Chapter Six Reformed Catholics, True Protestants: The Sixteenth Century in Later Stuart England	p. 289
Epilogue	p. 341
Bibliography	p. 344

Introduction

I.

How did the English Reformation get its name? This might seem like a question not worth asking because the answer should be obvious. According to Bob Scribner, “‘The Reformation’ is the general label historians use to describe the series of upheavals in the religious life of Europe during the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries.”¹ According to this line of reasoning, the English Reformation was therefore a ‘series of upheavals in the religious life of [England] during the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries’. Intuitively, it makes sense to apply Scribner’s words in this way. If one were to look at the vast amount of publishing concerned with ‘the Reformation’, one would find that the label describes both a transnational series of events and their more local manifestations. Just as one can read about the European Reformation,² one can also read about national histories such as the German Reformation, the Scottish Reformation, and the Swiss Reformation;³ one can just as easily peruse studies of Catholic responses to these, which are often collectively termed ‘the Counter-Reformation’ (on which, more below). Those interested in a chronological scope slightly larger than that given by Scribner can study the Bohemian Reformation and determine whether it was, as one recent study has argued, ‘the first Reformation’.⁴ And of course, one can read about the English Reformation. But did contemporaries describe religious upheavals as *the* Reformation? If not, why do we, and when did we begin to do so?

¹ Bob Scribner, Introduction, in Bob Scribner, Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich (eds.), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 1.

² See, e.g., Alister McGrath, *The Intellectual origins of the European Reformation*, second ed. (Blackwell Publishing, 2004); Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (Viking, 2004).

³ See, e.g., Thomas Brady, *German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400 – 1650* (Cambridge University Press, 2009); Alec Ryrie, *The origins of the Scottish Reformation* (Manchester University Press, 2006); Bruce Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester University Press, 2002).

⁴ Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Ashgate, 1998).

The Reformation is an unquestioned historiographical category because we have spent very little time studying the category itself. In 1985, A. G. Dickens, John M. Tonkin, and Kenneth Powell collaborated on a volume entitled *The Reformation in Historical Thought*, which was intended to ‘start breaking the ground’ on the study of Reformation historiography.⁵ The authors assumed, however, that the Reformation was conceptualized from the time of its inception. Their first chapter, entitled ‘Views from Within’, began by personifying its subject: ‘The Reformation inherited a mature world of humanism, aspiring not merely to eloquence but also to broad visions and periodizations of human history.’⁶ The Reformation was introduced as if it were wholly formed—wholly periodized—from the very beginning. The same assumption animated Rosemary O’Day’s 1986 volume *The Debate on the English Reformation*. O’Day’s volume seems to have been written without any knowledge of *The Reformation in Historical Thought*, which was not cited in the bibliography. O’Day opened her work with a chapter entitled ‘Contemporary Historiography of the English Reformation, 1525 – 70.’ As with Dickens, Tonkin, and Powell, she portrayed the Reformation as an event identifiable from its very beginning (and thus before its conclusion). O’Day even claimed that ‘It created its own historiography’, thereby giving the English Reformation the attribute of agency.⁷ A similar argument is found in Thomas Betteridge’s more recent *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530 – 83*. He concludes that ‘The English Reformation, a simple struggle between two coherent and opposing doctrinal camps, Protestant and Catholic, was a result and not the cause of the social and cultural conflicts that were the English Reformations.’⁸

⁵ A. G. Dickens and John M. Tonkin, with Kenneth Powell, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Harvard University Press, 1985), p. v.

⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

⁷ Rosemary O’Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (Routledge, 1986), p. 5.

⁸ Thomas Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530 – 83* (Ashgate, 1999), p. 218; emphasis in the original.

Regrettably, Betteridge does not attempt to historicize his key term, *reformation*, and this leaves us with a circuitous argument. One could argue that, insofar as historiographical analysis and self-awareness are the lifeblood of serious historical inquiry, historians have not really begun to study *the* Reformation at all.

In this study, I argue that when applied to religion, English authors used the word ‘reformation’ in a variety of ways between 1414 and 1688. The first originated in the fifteenth century at the Council of Constance (1414 – 1418), and referred to the authority of church councils to reform the wider church. Although the authority of councils was contested, almost everyone, including Martin Luther, spoke of reformation in this way until the mid-sixteenth century, when a second usage developed. It referred to the willingness of political militants to reform their churches through violence. In the British Isles, this discourse was most closely associated with the Anglo-Scots preacher John Knox. By the 1570s, the Elizabethan government suspected that those who dissented from the liturgy and polity of the Church of England were willing to follow Knox and forcibly impose their own vision of reformation. For the next century, English debates about reformation were both inspired and haunted by Knox’s usage. The third use of reformation is familiar to us today: a historical descriptor for sixteenth-century religious change. In England, this usage developed as a theological apologetic. The British civil wars of the 1640s were often fought in the name of reformation, and with the beheading of King Charles I and the outlawing of the Church of England, a small group of Anglican apologists set the word ‘reformation’ to a new end. It became a battle cry not for religious change, but for religious conservation. Defenses of *the* Reformation were appeals for preserving the religious changes of the Tudor past. With the restoration of the monarchy and the Church of England in 1660, this apologetic narrative rapidly became a historical certainty.

II.

Behind my opening question is a question of more general historical interest: how does one determine the parameters of an anachronism? In the last few decades, it has become increasingly popular to analyze not just past events, but the ways in which these events were later conceptualized. The Scientific Revolution is a good example. No one in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries claimed that they were living through an event called ‘the Scientific Revolution’, so why do we write and teach as if they did? When did people begin to refer to select events as ‘*the* Scientific Revolution’—a proper noun—since contemporaries did not speak that way? One influential line of research has gone so far as to deny the value of the very label. Steven Shapin opens his book *The Scientific Revolution* by declaring, ‘There was no such thing as the Scientific Revolution, and this is a book about it.’⁹ Shapin traces the term ‘Scientific Revolution’ to 1939, when the French philosopher Alexander Koyré first used it. Only in the 1950s, more than three hundred years after the events that it purports to describe, did Koyré’s neologism enter into common usage. So, is the label ‘the Scientific Revolution’ an accurate descriptor, or is it merely a convenient and by-now familiar oversimplification?

Similar studies have been done of other familiar historical labels such as the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and closer to the topic of the present inquiry, the Counter-Reformation. Historians have long used the last of these to describe Catholic responses to the development of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, but the term ‘Counter-Reformation’ actually dates to 1776. No less importantly, it was not coined by eighteenth-century Catholics but by the Protestant historian Johann Stephan Pütter. His argument was simple: because Catholics opposed Protestants and therefore the Reformation itself, the stance of sixteenth-century Catholics was

⁹ Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution* (University of Chicago Press, 1996), 1.

best described as *the* Counter-Reformation—again, a proper noun.¹⁰ ‘Counter-Reformation’ entered into common usage in the nineteenth century, first among Protestants and only later and grudgingly among Catholics. Intended as a value judgment, this term highlights an easy-to-miss but crucial point concerning the art of historical description. There can be—and there oftentimes is—both a power and a politics in naming.

There is an important methodological implication here. We need to distinguish between two kinds of historical descriptors. The first is *organic*—a term that arose in the time period that it purports to describe. The other kind of historical descriptor is *synthetic*, invented or crafted out of historically heterogeneous or even dissimilar conceptual materials. ‘The English Reformation’, a proper noun, is a synthetic historical descriptor. It did not develop in the sixteenth century but in the middle of the seventeenth, and a confluence of political and theological factors led to its rise, dissemination, and acceptance. As both asynchronous and polemical, ‘the English Reformation’ is less descriptive than prescriptive, and as we will see, the very term imports a range of normative theological judgments into our own discussions of sixteenth-century history. Studying religion in sixteenth-century England is not the same as studying the English Reformation, because the real history of ‘the English Reformation’ is the history of how the term was developed in a later era but applied to an earlier one. Not all historical terms are synthetic. ‘The Restoration’ is a premier example of an organic label. From the very beginning of Charles II’s return to England in 1660, his many supporters celebrated his restoration as *the* Restoration. Organic political terms may therefore be value-laden, but studying the political and theological history of 1660 is one and the same as studying the Restoration itself.

¹⁰ John W. O’Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Harvard University Press, 2000), 19 – 21.

Methodologically, the present study is therefore quite different from Nicholas Tyacke's immensely influential volume *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590 – 1640*.¹¹ That volume began with Tyacke's own definitions of the Arminian and Calvinist religious movements that were his primary concern. A better approach would have been to show how those living in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries defined 'Calvinism' and 'Arminianism'. The present study looks at these labels along with several others, such as 'Protestant', 'Puritan', and 'Catholic', and the remarkable range of ways that contemporaries used such terms in theological and political debate. Today, some binaries seem obvious, such that between 'Protestant' and 'Catholic'. As we will see, contemporaries did not always see things this way, and when they did, it sometimes took a very, very long time for their perceptions—or, better, their *polemical descriptors*—to become established as culturally normative. Confessional labels, like the value-laden terms 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy', need to be studied as they were: as terms in historical motion. Tradition is the conscious cultivation of some contingencies at the expense of others. Studying religious history entails studying the history of such cultivation rather than assuming that abiding accuracy of our own assumptions.

III.

As a study of 'early modern' religious history, the following chapters interface with two facets of current Reformation historiography: that pertaining to Luther, and that pertaining to Protestant Scholasticism. We will take these in turn.

A German Hercules?

¹¹ Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590 – 1640*, new ed. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1990).

Many historians portray the fifteenth century as a ‘high road’ to Martin Luther’s life and work. A good example of this can be found in Nelson Minnich’s study ‘Concepts of Reform Proposed at the Fifth Lateran Council’. Referring to the beginning of the council in 1512, he writes that Luther ‘would within five years stir up such discords over the Church Lateran failed to reform that eventually the unity of Western Christianity would be shattered.’¹² Minnich even concludes his study of discussions of reformation at Lateran V by reifying the common noun into a proper noun, an event led by Luther who ‘eight months after the close of the Council heralded *the* Reformation.’¹³ Luther and ‘the Reformation’ loom just as large in John W. O’Malley’s recent work on the Council of Trent. The first chapter, tellingly entitled ‘The Fifteenth-Century Prelude’, concludes with O’Malley depicting ‘the Reformation’ as an event whose arrival was imminent.¹⁴ The next chapter opens with a very brief survey of Luther’s thought, which O’Malley describes as a ‘message’ that ‘sounded like the answer, finally, to the many calls for reform of the church that for so long had gone unheeded.’¹⁵ Like a modern day American evangelical, Luther ‘promised a more personal relationship with God’, and like a revolutionary his theology ‘set off a movement that convulsed Europe.’¹⁶ Heiko Oberman has written similarly, entitling the first part of his biography of Luther ‘The Longed-for Reformation’.¹⁷ Oberman observes that Luther ‘never styled himself a “reformer”...nor did he ever claim his movement to be the “Reformation.”’¹⁸ Nonetheless, from the very beginning of his book until the

¹² Nelson H. Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)* (Variorum, 1993), Essay IV, p. 178.

¹³ Ibid., Essay IV, p. 236; emphasis mine.

¹⁴ John W. O’Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), p. 48.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 49.

¹⁷ Heiko Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (Yale University Press, 1989), p. 1.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 79.

very end, Luther is made inseparable from an event called ‘*the* Reformation’¹⁹ and he is frequently styled ‘*the* Reformer’.²⁰ Other historians have relied upon temporal imagery. The fifth chapter of Steven Ozment’s work, entitled ‘On the Eve of the Reformation’, begins by charting the key political developments which ‘proved important to the success of the Protestant Reformation.’²¹ Similarly, Alister McGrath’s emphasis upon ‘heterogeneity’ of the Reformation does not prevent him from writing, like Ozment, of ‘the eve of the Reformation’.²² Whereas Hans Holbein portrayed Luther as ‘the German Hercules’, in the historical narratives just surveyed, Luther is even bigger: he strides unencumbered across the stage of world history. I reject the accuracy of this approach.

I also reject what comes from it. With Luther made larger than life, ideas associated with him—even when associated erroneously—take on new meaning. The premier example of this is ‘the priesthood of all believers’, which occupies a key conceptual role in much scholarship on the sixteenth century.²³ Luther is widely credited as the inventor of this doctrine,²⁴ and it is often claimed that he first advanced his iconoclastic vision of the Christian church in his open letter of 1520 *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*. For example, in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther’s Theology*, Volker Leppin writes that Luther ‘took the attribution of the priesthood away from those ordained or consecrated for holy service and transferred it to all the baptized’. Leppin quotes *To the Christian Nobility* as evidence: ‘Whoever crawls out of the

¹⁹ Ibid., e.g., pp. 8, 10, 20, 28, 55, 72, 98, 124, 132, 155, 173, 179, 219, 225, 233, 275, 296, 314, etc. This list is not exhaustive.

²⁰ Ibid., e.g., 7, 10, 44, 49, 88, 92, 98, 110, 125, 146, 151, 153, 168, 179, 219, 275, 300; emphasis mine. This list is not exhaustive.

²¹ Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform 1250 – 1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (Yale University Press, 1980), p. 182.

²² McGrath, *Intellectual Origins*, p. 188.

²³ See, e.g., the essays in David Bagchi and David Steinmetz (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 36, 46 – 7, 62, 110, 182, 199 – 200.

²⁴ See, e.g., the essays in Donald K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Martin Luther* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 44, 86, 99, 102, 114, 196, 268 – 9; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Spirit Versus Structure: Luther and the Institutions of the Church* (Collins, 1968), esp. pp. 37 – 43; David V. N. Bagchi, *Luther’s Earliest Opponents: Catholic Controversialists 1518 – 1525* (Augsburg Fortress, 1991), p. 100.

water of baptism can boast that he has already been consecrated a priest, bishop, and pope... It follows from this argument that there is truly no essential difference among laity, priest, prince, bishop as they say, in terms of responsibility or assignment, and in terms of their place in society.²⁵ Leppin's words appear quite persuasive, but his ellipsis conceals much. His quotation actually combines two separate sentences while excising key qualifying statements; without the ellipsis, the first part of Leppin's quote would further read, 'although of course it is not seemly that just anybody should exercise such an office.'²⁶ We find an important distinction here between estate and office; sharing in the former does not necessarily qualify a Christian to hold the latter. Leppin's ellipsis further obscures an important elaboration upon this same distinction, for just a few sentences later, Luther explains, 'Therefore a priest in Christendom is nothing else but an officeholder.' Priesthood was not a matter of estate, but a matter of office—an office that was *not* open to every member of the Christian estate. Finally, the second half of Leppin's quote is immediately followed by two sentences that qualify Luther's supposed innovation still further: 'They are all of the spiritual estate, all are truly priests, bishops, and popes. *But they do not all have the same work to do.*'²⁷ Notably, slightly earlier in the same letter, Luther had written, 'all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate, and there is no difference among them *except that of office.*'²⁸ Where in any of this is the so-called 'priesthood of all believers'?

No one in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries ever talked about a priesthood of all believers. Evangelicals continued to look upon the ordained ministry as something quasi-sacramental at the very least; in some instances, they affirmed that it simply was a sacrament.

²⁵ Volker Leppin, 'Luther's Transformation of Medieval Thought', in Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel, and L'ubomír Batka (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology* (Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 119. I have here reproduced Leppin's own translation; the English translation can be found in LW, vol. 44, p. 129.

²⁶ LW, vol. 44, p. 129.

²⁷ Ibid.; emphasis added.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 127; emphasis added.

The latter view was explicit in Philip Melanchthon's 1559 revision of his *Loci Communes*. In Locus XIII, after naming Baptism, Eucharist, and Confession as sacraments, Melanchthon wrote, 'In my opinion there is considerable merit in adding also ordination, that is, the call into the ministry of the Gospel and the public approval of this call'.²⁹ Slightly later, he explained,

The teaching on ordination, when it is listed among the sacraments, should remind us of all of these things, of the efficacy of the ministry, of prayer for the ministry, of the functions that belong to the ministry, [and] of the punishments for spurning the ministry; and the rite itself, when we publicly witness the very ancient practice, undoubtedly approved by the earliest fathers, namely, the laying on of hands, which was always a sign of something set aside for the worship of God, has also been a sign of His blessing.³⁰

Evangelical confessional documents consistently affirmed that the ordained ministry was necessary, and as we will see in chapter two, Luther identified it as one of the visible marks of the Church. In England, as later chapters will show, arguments about the ordained ministry were inseparable from arguments about the visible order of the visible church—a conviction that remained true through the seventeenth century.

Almost every church held that its clergy were invested with 'the power of the keys' and thus the power to either absolve or retain sin. We see this in the Church of England's canon law, in both the failed *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (1553) and the long-used Jacobean *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (1604).³¹ The same is true in Presbyterian writings; the Westminster Confession affirmed that Christ had 'appointed a government in the hand of Church

²⁹ Philip Melanchthon, *The Chief Theological Topics: Loci Praecipui Theologici 1559*, trans. J. A. O. Preus, second ed. (Concordia Publishing House, 2011), p. 258.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

³¹ *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, e.g., 32.1 – 2 (p. 433), 33 (p. 489), in Gerald Bray (ed.), *Tudor Church Reform* (The Boydell Press, 2000), p. 231; The Church of England, *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (London, 1604; STC 10070), Canon XXXI.

officers’ and that ‘To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins’.³² The Council of Trent tellingly neither condemned nor even commented upon a Protestant doctrine called ‘the priesthood of all believers’. However, by assuming the truthfulness of this anachronism, we miss an immensely interesting history, *all* of which points in a *singular* direction: evangelicals believed in the ordained ministry and that it was a necessary mark of the visible church. Furthermore, some considered it a sacrament. It is wrong to propose that an über-Herculean Luther led all Protestants to advance notions of either the church or the ordained ministry that were wholly at variance with Catholic orthodoxy. By not assuming that all of Luther’s contemporaries perceived him as equally important, and by not assuming that he led a revolutionary religious movement, chapters two through four, like chapter six, look at some of the ways that Luther’s importance rose and fell in England over the course of the centuries here under review. Luther was but one figure among many others in the sixteenth century. The importance that we now give to him and to his ideas is not only unjustified but oftentimes there mere inheritance of later interpretive frameworks.

Protestant Scholasticism

The growth of scholarship on Protestant scholasticism has also shaped these chapters. The work of Richard Muller is at the center of this historiography. One year before Nicholas Tyacke published *Anti-Calvinists*, Muller published *Christ and the Decree*, a revised version of his dissertation, which concerned the relationship of Christology and predestination in Reformed theology. Muller advocates using the term ‘Reformed theology’ rather than ‘Calvinism’ because,

³² The Westminster Assembly, *The Westminster Confession*, ch. XXX.I – II (‘Of Church Censures’), in Philip Schaff (ed.), *The Creeds of Christendom*, Three Vols. (Harper and Row, 1931; reprinted by Baker Books, 2007), Vol. III, p. 667.

in his words, ‘Calvin’s influence was great but not exclusive.’³³ By rejecting the reductionist tendency implied by the term ‘Calvinism’, Muller locates Reformed theology as part of the much older tradition of theological voluntarism that developed in reaction to the theological rationalism of Thomas Aquinas. Reformed ideas about predestination were not developed by any one figure—in this case, John Calvin—but were simply part of the much longer history of Christian theology. In order to study Reformed theology in context, Muller argues that we must study scholasticism, the university-based theology that informed all early modern Christian discussion and debate.

Scholasticism began in the twelfth century, when a growing amount of Christian theology was written in the context of European universities. Theologians not only became increasingly familiar with logic, philosophy, and other academic disciplines, but under the influence of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, the validity of theological argument came to be partially determined by the authorities that a given theologian appealed to. The principal authority was the Bible, but the decrees of councils, the determinations of canon law, and the writings of earlier, orthodox Christians were also sources of theological authority. Drawing attention to its academic origins, Muller denies that scholasticism entailed any particular doctrinal content. Rather, “‘Scholasticism’” ought simply to indicate the formal theology of the systems and doctrinal compendia developed out of the classroom experience of the academies and universities.’³⁴ All academic theology was bound by shared methodological concerns such as logical deduction and the systematic order of *loci*, the major theological topics. Sixteenth-century theology, regardless of its confessional orientation, was the same. By studying Reformed theology within the context of scholasticism, Muller shows that the doctrine of predestination, despite having been a topic of

³³ Richard Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Baker Academic, 2008), p. 39.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

academic interest and concern for many centuries—it was discussed by figures as diverse as Peter Lombard,³⁵ Thomas Aquinas,³⁶ and William Ockham³⁷—was not the theological *principium* or dogmatic foundation of the Reformed tradition. John Calvin’s systematic *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (mildly mistranslated today as *Institutes of the Christian Religion*) is an excellent illustration of this; comprised of four books, predestination was not discussed in the *Institutio* until the end of book three. Because a theologian’s ordering of theological topics was itself a theological argument, predestination—placed so late in the work—cannot be interpreted as Calvin’s primary doctrinal emphasis, any more than that of the Reformed tradition more broadly.

Paralleling scholarship on Protestant Scholasticism has been a growth of academic interest in Arminius, a seventeenth-century Dutch pastor widely but erroneously thought to have opposed Calvin’s theology. This historiographical turn was termed ‘The New Perspective on Arminius’ by Keith D. Stanglin, a student of Muller’s, in 2009.³⁸ It developed out of older scholarship, primarily Carl Bangs’ 1985 biography of Arminius and Muller’s 1991 study on the relationship of Arminius to scholasticism. Stanglin is at the center of this historiographical shift, not least because of his discovery and subsequent publication of three-dozen of Arminius’ theological disputations, all of which were previously believed lost.³⁹ According to Stanglin, Arminius has been subject to a wide variety of interpretive glosses, which he describes as generally tending in one of four directions. Some have claimed that Arminius was a ‘heretic’, but

³⁵ Sent., Book 1, Dist. 39 c4 and Dist. 40.

³⁶ ST, 1a. q. 23.

³⁷ William Ockham, *Predestination, God’s Foreknowledge, and Future Contingents*, second edition, translated and edited by Marilyn McCord Adams and Norman Kretzmann (Hackett Publishing Company, 1983).

³⁸ Keith D. Stanglin, ‘The New Perspective on Arminius: Notes on a Historiographical Shift’, *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2009), pp. 295 – 310; see also Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 3 – 24.

³⁹ Keith D. Stanglin (ed.), *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Notes* (Brill, 2010).

others, in reaction to this, have portrayed Arminius as a ‘saint’; some have represented Arminius as an opponent of scholasticism, and still others have argued that Arminius rejected all predestinarian doctrine.⁴⁰ Unlike these four approaches, ‘this new perspective on Arminius eschews overtly dogmatic agendas’, and argues that ‘The study of Arminius should not be theologically driven, but historically driven.’⁴¹ By turning to the historical context, Stanglin, like Muller, locates Arminius within the much larger historical arc of scholastic theology, both Protestant and Catholic. In the early seventeenth century, a number of ideas existed about predestination, and accepting one variant of the doctrine entailed denying others. Arminius endorsed a version of predestination that offered human beings a wide scope of free choice. This was unusual within Reformed theology, although Arminius’ recently discovered theological disputations reveal him as a theologian interested in a wide variety of theological topics, not just that for which he is known today. Following Muller’s denial of predestination as the *principium* of Reformed theology, Stanglin argues that Arminius cannot be accurately understood if one primarily refers to seventeenth-century soteriological debates. As will be seen in chapter four, this has allowed me to reconsider how Arminius was portrayed in Jacobean and Caroline England, thus bringing to the fore political misrepresentations of him.

IV.

This study also intersects two current trends in the contemporary historiography of early modern British religion: the ‘Calvinist Consensus’ and the question of when English Christians became ‘Protestant’. I reject the first and I offer a method for answering the second. Other, more particular matters of historiographical debate are discussed in the chapters themselves.

⁴⁰ Stanglin, ‘The New Perspective on Arminius’, pp. 296 – 302.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 303.

A 'Calvinist Consensus'?

English sixteenth- and seventeenth-century confessional alliance has long been read against a European background presumably split between three clearly defined ecclesiastical groups: the Lutherans, the Reformed, and the Roman Catholic. Imposing such a simple demarcation is wrong. By 1570, the evangelical movement begun by Luther had become highly fragmented. One pair of divisions centered on which version of the Augsburg Confession was used. Some advocated the *Invariata*, the original text of 1530, while others advocated the *Variata*, which contained changes made to the Augsburg Confession by its author Philip Melancthon, primarily in 1540, to the doctrine of the Eucharist. Rather confusingly, both groups called themselves 'reformed'. In the 1570s, a movement grew that sought to unite those who advocated the *Invariata*; known as the Concordist movement, it grew in momentum and influence over the course of the decade, drafting the Formula of Concord in 1577 and gathering it together with a number of other works, including the *Invariata*, into the *Book of Concord* in 1580. The German Lutheran princes subsequently pursued a confessionally-refined 'Pax Lutheranorum' which slowly undermined the 1555 Peace of Augsburg.⁴² Advocates of the *Invariata*—the Reformed (to use Muller's terminology)—were not given religious toleration in the Holy Roman Empire until the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. Even then, the term 'reformed' remained a contested label; Lutherans described their opponents as 'reformed' only with qualification.⁴³ Although a divide existed between proponents of the *Variata* and the *Invariata* from the mid-sixteenth century onward, historians cannot accurately use the term 'Reformed'

⁴² Brady, *German Histories in the Age of Reformations*, pp. 266 – 8.

⁴³ Benjamin T. G. Mayes, *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning After the Reformation* (Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 117 – 18.

only in reference to the latter group. Confessional difference did not map terminological stasis but instead animated a terminological variability that existed well into the seventeenth century.

Historians of British religion have spent too little time engaging the confessional fluidity of European evangelicals in the mid-late sixteenth century. This neglect is partially due to nineteenth-century historiographical developments. On the one hand, as E. I. Kouri noted more than thirty years ago, the standard collections of Tudor State Papers are incomplete; they contain a ‘paucity of out-letters’, particularly for Germany, and the German and other European archives that contain these letters ‘have remained almost untouched’.⁴⁴ With so much of this material scattered and unedited, it is difficult to approach the topic in a systematic way. On the other hand, we run into a similar problem with the standard collections of Elizabethan-era theological correspondence, for these volumes are also incomplete. In the nineteenth century, the Parker Society published two large collections of material: the two-volume *Zurich Letters*,⁴⁵ and the two-volume *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, the subtitle of which states that these too came ‘chiefly from the Archives of Zurich’.⁴⁶ However, we should pause before accepting these epistolary canons as accurate reflections of sixteenth-century ecclesiastical realities. The Parker Society formed in the 1840s as a response to the burgeoning Anglo-Catholic movement in the Church of England, and primarily reprinted those writings that seemed most inimical to the new ‘high church’ movement.⁴⁷ By publishing four volumes of almost exclusively Swiss correspondence, the Parker Society made it appear as if the Church of England’s earliest

⁴⁴ E. I. Kouri, *Elizabethan England and Europe: Forty Unprinted Letters from Elizabeth I to Protestant Powers* (Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 1982), pp. 4, 6.

⁴⁵ Hastings Robinson (ed.), *The Zurich Letters* (Cambridge University Press, 1842); Idem., *The Zurich Letters (Second Series)* (Cambridge University Press, 1845).

⁴⁶ Hastings Robinson (ed.), *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation (The First Portion)* (Cambridge University Press, 1846); Idem., *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation (The Second Portion)* (Cambridge University Press, 1847).

⁴⁷ Peter Toon, ‘The Parker Society’, *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, vol. 46, no. 3 (1977), pp. 323 – 332.

theological sympathies were with the iconoclastic, anti-ceremonial Swiss evangelicals. The *Zurich Letters* contains only one letter pertaining to Lutheranism, a letter written by Archbishop Matthew Parker to Matthias Flacius and his colleagues.⁴⁸ In the *Original Letters*, Lutheran correspondence was restricted to merely three entries—two letters written by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer to Philip Melanchthon in 1549 and 1552, and one letter by Melanchthon to Martin Bucer in 1531.⁴⁹ Melanchthon offers an informative perspective on the correspondence collected by the Parker Society, for his epistolary dialogue with Cranmer and other English reformers was far more extensive than these few entries indicate.⁵⁰ The same can be said for the correspondence of Queen Elizabeth; the Parker Society volumes include several letters between her and various Swiss evangelicals, but they wholly ignored her correspondence with German Lutheran princes. The Parker Society volumes were created to witness to a partisan vision of England's Christian past. They should not be treated as anything other.

The Parker Society's strange neglect of Lutheranism has had a remarkable afterlife.⁵¹ In 2002, Alec Ryrie published an article entitled 'The Strange Death of Lutheran England'.⁵² He concluded that after 1546, English Lutheranism no longer had a future; under Edward VI and Elizabeth I, evangelicals in the Church of England pursued a Reformed confessional stance.⁵³ When Ryrie's paper appeared, his conclusions were part of a consistent historiographical trend. Only one monograph was then available on the English reception of Luther. Its author, Carl Trueman, concluded that with the passing of Henry VIII, a 'crumbling of consensus' followed in

⁴⁸ Robinson (ed.), *Zurich Letters (Second Series)*, pp. 76 – 80.

⁴⁹ Robinson (ed.), *Original Letters (First Portion)*, pp. 21 – 2, 25 – 6; Idem., *Original Letters (Second Portion)*, pp. 556 – 7.

⁵⁰ Additional correspondence with Cranmer is discussed in John Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 160 – 65; for correspondence with Elizabeth, see p. 188.

⁵¹ For an excellent overview of recent historiography, see David Scott Gehring, 'From the Strange Death to the Odd Afterlife of Lutheran England', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 57, issue 3, September 2014, pp. 825 – 844.

⁵² Alec Ryrie, 'The Strange Death of Lutheran England'. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 53, no. 1 (January, 2002), pp. 64 – 92.

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 68, 91.

which new matters of theological debate undermined the coherence of a simple Lutheran/Catholic divide in England.⁵⁴ Similar views on the obsolescence of Lutheranism in Edwardian and Elizabethan England can be found in the works of Dewey Wallace,⁵⁵ Christopher Haigh,⁵⁶ and Diarmaid MacCulloch.⁵⁷ This general perception is exemplified by the miniscule number of academic articles on English responses to the Augsburg Confession or *Augustana* (1530),⁵⁸ the Formula of Concord (1577),⁵⁹ and early Lutheran theology more generally.⁶⁰

The first major exception to this tendency was the work of E. I. Kouri, who argued that Lutheranism was a matter of continued confessional and diplomatic interest through the 1560s.⁶¹ Although the decade since 2002 has seen the publication of three monographs concerned with Anglo-German relations and the influence of Lutheranism in England, these too have focused upon the first half of the sixteenth century.⁶² Similarly, in *Sister Reformations – Schwesterreformationen*, a 2010 volume of essays on the English and German reformations, only three of its thirteen essays pertain to Elizabethan England.⁶³ Ryrie's contribution to this volume,

⁵⁴ Carl R. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525 – 1556* (The Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 289 – 90.

⁵⁵ Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525 – 1695* (North Carolina University Press, 1982), pp. 73 – 5.

⁵⁶ Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (The Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 191.

⁵⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 617, 621 – 2; Idem., *The Later Reformation in England, 1547 – 1603*, second ed. (Palgrave, 2001), pp. 59 – 60.

⁵⁸ James H. Pragman, 'The Augsburg Confession in the English Reformation: Richard Taverner's Contribution', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 75 – 85.

⁵⁹ W. B. Patterson, 'The Anglican Reaction', in Lewis W. Spitz and Wenzel Lohff (eds.), *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord: Studies in the Lutheran Reformation's Dialogue of Concord* (Fortress Press, 1977), pp. 150 – 65; of related interest is Francis J. Watson, 'Robert Vaux and Martin Chemnitz: An Anglican-Lutheran Encounter', *Anglican Theological Review*, vol. 79, no. 1 (Wint. 1997), pp. 38 – 44.

⁶⁰ Hirofumi Horie, 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement, 1558 – 1563', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 34, no. 3 (Sep., 1991), pp. 519 – 37.

⁶¹ E. I. Kouri, *Elizabethan England and Europe*; Idem., *England and the Attempts to form a Protestant Alliance in the Late 1560s: A Case in European Diplomacy* (Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1981).

⁶² Rory McEntegart, *Henry VIII, The League of Schmalkalden, and the English Reformation* (The Boydell Press, 2002); Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*, was published in 2006; Michael S. Whiting, *Luther in English: The Influence of His Theology of Law and Gospel on Early Evangelicals (1525 – 35)* (Pickwick Publications, 2010).

⁶³ Dorothea Wedenbourg (ed.), *Sister Reformations – Schwesterreformationen* (Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

entitled ‘The Afterlife of Lutheran England’, primarily surveys perceptions of Luther between 1547 and 1660, although Ryrie also looks at the reception of several Lutheran texts.⁶⁴ Despite noting a growth of interest in the topic,⁶⁵ the picture here is essentially unchanged from 2002; the influence of Melancthon died c. 1540, the Elizabethan reception of Luther was minimal, and the only Lutheran emphasis retained by the Church of England was something called ‘a theology of the cross’.⁶⁶ Given David Scott Gehring’s recent study, which argues that Anglo-German relations were of central importance for the bulk of Elizabeth’s reign, the historiographical guard may soon change.⁶⁷ But one could also be forgiven for assuming that there is little if any story to tell.

Nicholas Tyacke’s monograph *Anti-Calvinists* remains the most influential argument for a ‘Calvinist consensus’ in the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church of England. Originally a dissertation completed in 1968, a number of articles followed before the dissertation was revised and published in 1987.⁶⁸ Tyacke’s definition of Calvinism focused solely upon the doctrine of predestination: ‘The characteristic theology of English Protestant sainthood was Calvinism, centring on a belief in divine predestination, both double and absolute, whereby man’s destiny, either election to Heaven or reprobation to Hell, is not conditioned by faith but depends instead on the will of God.’⁶⁹ Having clearly defined Calvinism, what else could ‘anti-Calvinism’ be but the *rejection* of ‘a belief in divine predestination, both double and absolute’? In Elizabethan England, many if not most church leaders endorsed the doctrine of predestination; consequently, Tyacke concludes that before the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, ‘Calvinism was the *de*

⁶⁴ Alec Ryrie, ‘The Afterlife of Lutheran England’, in Wedenbourg (ed.), *Sister Reformations*, pp. 213 – 34.

⁶⁵ Ryrie, ‘The Afterlife of Lutheran England’, p. 214.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 213, 226 – 7.

⁶⁷ David Scott Gehring, *Anglo-German Relations and the Protestant Cause: Elizabethan Foreign Policy and Pan-Protestantism* (Pickering and Chatto, 2013).

⁶⁸ Many of these articles were later collected in Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530 – 1700* (Manchester University Press, 2001).

⁶⁹ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 1.

facto religion of the Church of England'.⁷⁰ Tyacke's argument has been supported by many of his colleagues,⁷¹ and in a review of *Anti-Calvinists*, Christopher Haigh described Tyacke's thesis as 'one of the most influential doctoral theses of recent decades.'⁷² Another historian has written of a 'Tyackeian consensus' within contemporary historical scholarship,⁷³ and still others have written of a more general 'Calvinist consensus'.⁷⁴ Anti- or non-Calvinist churchmanship is considered to have been so rare, particularly under Elizabeth and James VI and I, that it has even been described as 'avant-garde'.⁷⁵

An important facet of the 'Calvinist consensus' is the argument that under Charles I, a new expression of English churchmanship arose called 'Laudianism'. In an influential article published in 1993, Peter Lake defined Laudianism as 'a coherent, distinctive and polemically aggressive vision of the church, the divine presence in the world and the appropriate ritual

⁷⁰ Ibid., p 7.

⁷¹ See, e.g., R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, second ed. (Paternoster, 1997); Dewey D. Wallace, Jr., *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525 – 1695* (North Carolina University Press, 1982); Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559 – 1625* (Oxford University Press, 1982), e.g., pp. 78, 81 – 3, 138, 177; Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Apr. 1985), pp. 169-207; Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (University of Toronto Press, 2009), e.g., pp. 64 – 5, 123, 173; Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590 – 1640* (Ashgate, 2014), e.g., pp. 9 – 14, 209, 352. These assumption lie in the background of recent work on Caroline England, such as Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford University Press, 1990), esp. pp. 83 – 108; Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Pearson, 2005), pp. 82 – 103; Michael Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (Penguin Books, 2008), pp. 20 – 1, 47 – 8; see also Graham Parry, *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud and Honour* (Boydell, 2006).

⁷² Christopher Haigh, Review of *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590 – 1640*, *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 103, No. 407 (Apr., 1988), p. 425.

⁷³ Kenneth Fincham, 'Preface', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603 – 1642* (Stanford University Press, 1993), p. vii.

⁷⁴ Peter White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), e.g., p. x; Margo Todd, "'All One with Tom Thumb": Arminianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge', *Church History*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (Dec., 1995), pp. 563 – 79, here p. 563; Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 105. See also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600 – 1640* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 8, esp. n. 14, 384 – 95; John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation 1603 – 1714* (Pearson Longman, 2006), 19 – 24.

⁷⁵ Peter Lake, 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 113 – 33.

response to that presence.’⁷⁶ Lake’s essay is considered a landmark work in the study of Laudianism; Anthony Milton describes it as ‘by far the best account of Laudian ideology that we have’.⁷⁷ Like Collinson, Tyacke, Milton, and others, Lake argues that Laudianism combined ‘anti-Calvinist’ or ‘Arminian’ theology with a novel form of liturgical ceremonial, a renewed support for religious artwork, and a dislike of preaching, all of which the Laudians attempted to impose upon the rest of England during the personal rule of Charles I.⁷⁸ Several problems exist with this historiographical consensus. For example, Lake’s description either ignores or is unaware of the fact that Arminius opposed the devotional use of images.⁷⁹ Rather inconveniently, Lake also concedes that there was ‘no classic statement of the position, no Laudian *summa* but instead a whole series of *livres de circonstances*... The result is a patchwork of sources, uneven in their coverage of the polemical or theological ground, sporadic in their production.’⁸⁰ Another caveat may be found in the general recognition that despite being the inspiration for the term, Archbishop William Laud was not the ideological center of the group.⁸¹ Milton even argues that

⁷⁶ Peter Lake, ‘The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s’, in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church*, pp. 161 – 85, here p. 162.

⁷⁷ Anthony Milton, ‘The creation of Laudianism: a new approach’, in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 162 – 84, here p. 164.

⁷⁸ Lake, ‘The Laudian Style’, pp. 181 – 2; Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants*, e.g., pp. 8, 85, 112, 149; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, is pervasively concerned with this matter, but see especially pp. 106 – 24; idem., ‘Archbishop Laud’, in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church*, pp. 51 – 70; Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625 – 1641* (Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 46 – 86; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, e.g., pp. 8 – 9, 210 – 15, 435 – 47; Cust, *Charles I*, pp. 133 – 47. For more general studies of ‘Laudianism’, see Iain M. MacKenzie, *God’s Order and Natural Law: The works of the Laudian Divines* (Ashgate, 2002); Graham Parry, *Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation*. Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, argues that ‘Laudianism’ should be supplemented with the term ‘Carolinism’, which underscores the influence of Charles I upon the Caroline church; Kenneth Fincham, ‘The Restoration of Altars in the 1630s’, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Dec., 2001), pp. 919 – 940.

⁷⁹ Jacob Arminius, ‘On reconciling religious Dissensions among Christians’, in *The Works of James Arminius*, Three Vols., edited by James Nichols and William Nichols (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1825; repr. with corrected pagination, Beacon Hill Press, 1986), Vol. I, p. 450.

⁸⁰ Lake, ‘The Laudian Style’, p. 163; Milton, ‘The Creation of Laudianism’, pp. 163 – 4, 180 – 2, agrees.

⁸¹ This is the consistent argument of Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*; Fincham, ‘The Restoration of Altars in the 1630s’, pp. 924 – 6, portrays Laud as one who followed rather than initiated change.

‘the chief ideologue of the Laudian movement’ was actually Laud’s chaplain, Peter Heylyn.⁸² Furthermore, many so-called ‘Laudians’ were avid preachers—and in this, they were like every other Christian church, including the Catholic. To these critiques it should be finally added that no one in the seventeenth century ever called themselves a ‘Laudian’. The Dissenting minister and theologian Richard Baxter seems to have coined this term only in 1691, and although it was sometimes used in the eighteenth century along with the variant ‘Laudist’, it did not become widespread until the mid-nineteenth century.⁸³

The real payout in historicizing these religious labels comes when we turn to studying the British civil wars of the 1640s. Since the historiographical rise of revisionism, it has become commonplace to assert that there was no high road to the civil wars that engulfed the British Isles between the late 1630s and early 1650s.⁸⁴ As Conrad Russell explains, ‘England in 1637 was a country in working order, and was not on the edge of revolution.’⁸⁵ However, the lack of a high road to civil war need not indicate the lack of a consistent one. By the late 1630s, a number of people on both sides of the Anglo-Scots border had spent decades developing and cultivating theological justifications for resisting and overthrowing political authorities that they considered unjust and/or unorthodox. They termed their revolt ‘reformation’. In their sense of the word, ‘reformation’ was less concerned to attack scholastic debates about predestination and far more concerned with abrogating the allegedly tyrannical institution of episcopacy and the purportedly superstitious and idolatrous ceremonies contained in the Book of Common Prayer. The Calvinist consensus argues that ‘Laudianism’ upset the consensus and resulted in civil war. I argue that

⁸² Milton, ‘The creation of Laudianism’, p. 165.

⁸³ Oxford English Dictionary (third edition, 2012), ‘Laudian’.

⁸⁴ Several historiographical overviews exist. See especially John Kenyon, ‘Revisionism and Post-Revisionism in Early Stuart History’, *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 64, no. 4 (Dec., 1992), pp. 686 – 699; Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake, ‘Revisionism and its legacies: the work of Conrad Russell’, in Thomas Cogswell, et. al., *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Early Stuart Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 1 – 17.

⁸⁵ Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637 – 1642* (Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 1.

since the late 1550s, a small but militant minority were looking for a fight; they found both a fight and a victory in Scotland in the 1560s, and with the introduction of a Book of Common Prayer to Scotland in 1637, adherents of this same ideology, who soon began calling themselves Covenanters, embarked upon what was, in effect, another holy war. ‘Laudianism’ did not create the Covenanters’ political theology, and what is more, no war can possibly be explained by a party label that contemporaries did not use. Studying how contemporaries discussed and debated reformation reveals that only one thing is remarkably about the British civil wars: that they did not happen sooner.

Protestantism

Much recent historiography of early modern British religion has also been preoccupied with the question of when the English people ceased being Catholic and became Protestant. Christopher Haigh has located the change in the latter part of Elizabeth’s reign, writing that, ‘In the 1580s, England was fast becoming a Protestant nation.’⁸⁶ He believes that only in that decade could one ‘identify a true Protestant Reformation: now ‘Protestant’ because it involved real changes in personal belief, not merely shifts in ecclesiastical policy; now ‘Reformation’ because there were widespread conversions, not merely the localized persuasions of a Latimer and a Hooper.’⁸⁷ Haigh denies that this Protestant Reformation was in the end successful, but others have taken up his language of conversion to describe the religious changes that occurred in Tudor England. Drawing attention to the sometimes surprising collaborations between iconoclastic religious ideology and personal greed, Ethan Shagan has noted that ‘Popular political actors could use the Reformation in their local politics’ in ways that were neither

⁸⁶ Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations*, p. 279

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

‘disingenuous’ nor ‘precisely Protestant’.⁸⁸ Shagan does not try to answer the question of when England became Protestant; he simply assumes that ‘Protestant’ and ‘Reformation’ were defined clearly enough in the early-mid sixteenth century that contemporaries could manipulate one or the other even while also refusing them. More recently, in 2013 Alec Ryrie published a study intended to illuminate how English men and women practiced Protestantism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Like Tyacke, Ryrie defined his key term at the outset; he informed his readers that he would largely ignore those termed ‘separatists, radicals, or sectarians’ as well as ‘Laudians and other 17th-century prophets of ceremonial revival.’⁸⁹ Neither Haigh nor Shagan nor Ryrie tell us what ‘Protestant’ and ‘Reformation’ meant to those living in Tudor England—but why should they? The meaning of these words is obvious to us; it must have been just as obvious to those who lived centuries ago. Surely words are always and forever semantically stable, particularly when they developed in the *sturm und drang* of political and theological polemic (including but not limited to civil war, regicide, and authoritarian revolutionary regimes). Why ask a question that raises the possibility that things might be otherwise?

Few scholars have done so, but the exceptions have been notable. In 1995, Margo Todd proposed that historians should ‘ask how our seventeenth-century subjects perceived their own story, and whether in their telling of it we cannot discover more about them than in our own interpretive structures.’⁹⁰ At the time, there was little interest in such an approach, but in 2009 Peter Marshall—without any apparent knowledge of Todd’s earlier article—argued similarly in *The Journal of British Studies*, writing that historical research on the Reformation ‘needs to start

⁸⁸ Ethan H. Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 273.

⁸⁹ Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 6.

⁹⁰ Todd, “‘All One with Tom Thumb’”, p. 563.

and end with the story of how English Christians managed to redefine themselves.⁹¹ In the very same issue of the JBS, Debora Shuger set out to question the Calvinist consensus by surveying a number of leading figures in Elizabethan and Jacobean England.⁹² Naming her article after Sir John Harington, who described himself as ‘a protesting Catholic Puritan’,⁹³ Shuger revealed a wide range of approaches to doctrinal, devotional, and liturgical matters, even among those such as Robert Cecil, who are widely believed to have been sympathetic to supposed ‘Calvinists’ both at home and abroad. Finally, Peter Marshall wrote a 2012 article that traced English uses of the word ‘Protestant’ through the end of the sixteenth century.⁹⁴ The term was originally used in works of Catholic heresiology,⁹⁵ and although some English described themselves with terms such as ‘Protestant Catholike’, many others simply refused confessional labels, including ‘Calvinist’, seeing such labels as betrayals of the ideal of Christian unity.⁹⁶ As Marshall concludes, although self-identification as ‘Protestant’ occurred primarily after 1600,⁹⁷ the label ‘Calvinist’ was simply not used.⁹⁸ These articles exemplify how the Reformation *should* be studied: by looking at how *contemporaries* spoke of ‘reformation’ and any other related concepts.

Such an approach carries significant implications not only for those who study the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but for those who study later British history as well. For example, in her highly successful volume *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837*, Linda Colley argued that ‘Protestantism was the foundation that made the invention of Great Britain

⁹¹ Peter Marshall, ‘(Re)defining the English Reformation’, *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (July 2009), pp. 564 – 86, here p. 586.

⁹² Debora Shuger, ‘A Protesting Catholic Puritan in Elizabethan England’, *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (July 2009), pp. 587 – 630, here pp. 587, 609, 627.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 593.

⁹⁴ Peter Marshall, ‘The Naming of Protestant England’, *Past and Present*, No. 214 (Feb. 2012), pp. 87 – 128.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 95 – 6.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 106 – 7.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 106, 127 – 8.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

possible.⁹⁹ There has been no shortage of disagreement with Colley's thesis. David Armitage and Jim Smyth have both drawn attention to the theological and ecclesiological heterogeneity of eighteenth-century Britain;¹⁰⁰ looking more particularly at the union of 1707, Jeffrey Stephen has shown that Scots Presbyterians were deeply and sometimes violently opposed to any union with Episcopalians in their own land, and that they were no less fearful of interference by English bishops south of the Anglo-Scots border.¹⁰¹ In studying how people spoke of Protestantism between the mid-sixteenth and early-eighteenth centuries, this study offers extensive evidence that Colley's critics are correct. There was no shared sense of Protestant identity in the years before the union of 1707, and no sense of a shared Reformation between England and Scotland. The crooked timber of humanity is too wild and unruly for monocausal explanations to hold.

V.

Some will ask: what term should we use in place of 'the Reformation'? What should we call *it*? I propose: there is no *it* there to be named. From the late fourteenth century onward, the western church experienced repeated schisms, and from these it never recovered. Its recurring institutional disunity was compounded by growing arguments in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries about a variety of devotional practices, which soon became entangled with more articulate and sophisticated theological arguments. These came together in the localized schisms of the mid-sixteenth century, such as that which occurred in England between 1534 and 1553; the confessional solutions offered to these debates were legally entrenched in places such as the Holy Roman Empire through the Peace of Augsburg, and in England through the papal

⁹⁹ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837*, third ed. (Yale University Press, 2009), p. 54.

¹⁰⁰ David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge University Press, 2000); Jim Smyth, *The Making of the United Kingdom 1660 – 1800* (Longman, 2001).

¹⁰¹ Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh University Press, 2007).

excommunication of Queen Elizabeth in 1570. The western church did not collapse because of the protests of an abrasive German monk in 1517. The western church collapsed slowly between the late-fourteenth and mid-sixteenth centuries because it had become so diverse—in its appeals to authority, its devotional practices, and its theology—that it could no longer hold together. How people spoke about those events, both at the time and afterward, is the subject of what now follows.

Chapter One

The Body Broken:

Conciliar Reformation and Ecclesial Division

‘And so like an expert doctor the emperor’s concern should be to keep the body well so that the life-giving spirit can dwell in it properly because it is well-proportioned.’

- Nicholas of Cusa, *The Catholic Concordance*, para. 593¹⁰²

I.

In 1378, the western church split. For the next thirty-one years, two rival popes, one located in Rome and the other in Avignon, vied for the loyalty of Europe’s Christians. A council of bishops and political leaders gathered in Pisa attempted to resolve the schism by electing a new pope, Alexander V, in 1409. Unexpectedly, his election only exacerbated the situation, splitting the church between three papacies, the newest of which remained in Pisa. As the largest international institution of the day, the Catholic Church possessed immense influence, and the rending of the church threatened the rending of Europe as well. In order to try and restore unity, Sigismund, the king of Hungary, led a number of Europe’s leaders, including Alexander V’s successor John XXIII, to call a council in Constance, Germany in 1414. It became the largest council that the western church had ever seen, and its stated goal was no less ambitious: ‘union and reformation of the said church in head and in members’.¹⁰³ Attended by bishops, theologians, canon lawyers, religious, and royal delegations, more than 2,200 official representatives attended.¹⁰⁴ Almost ten thousand more were present in an unofficial capacity,¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Nicholas of Cusa, *The Catholic Concordance*, translated and edited by Paul E. Sigmund (Cambridge University Press, 1991), III.41, para. 593 (p. 320).

¹⁰³ DEC, Vol. I, p. 407.

¹⁰⁴ Phillip H. Stump, ‘The Council of Constance and the End of the Schism’, in Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Izbicki (eds.), *A Companion to the Great Western Schism (1378 – 1417)* (Brill, 2009), pp. 395 – 442, here p. 403; Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Poets, Saints, and Visionaries of the Great Schism, 1378 – 1417* (The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), p. 201.

and when combined with the number of occasional visitors and other pilgrims, perhaps as many as 70,000 people attended the council at one point or another.¹⁰⁶ The unprecedented background to the council enabled its resolutions to be immensely influential. For more than a century and a half after it concluded, western Christians looked back to Constance. Its conception of reformation as a complete transformation of the entire church proved especially influential.

I.

Corporeal imagery was central to how Constance understood its work. Throughout its four years of deliberation, the council repeatedly described its goal as ‘reformation’, using the phrase ‘in head and in members’ (‘in capite et in membris’) to indicate that its reformation pertained to the whole ecclesial body.¹⁰⁷ The metaphor of the social body was not new in the early fifteenth century, and as we will see in future chapters, it remained no less central to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thought. Much of this consistency was due to the use of shared textual sources among Christians, such as the writings of ancient Greek and Roman political theorists, and the Bible above all. In the *Politics*, Aristotle had described the ideal *polis* as a rightly proportioned body, and later ancient authors used and elaborated the same imagery when writing, for example, of the Roman Empire. Christians had used corporeal imagery since the mid-first century, when the apostle Paul described the church with a series of somatic images in his first (surviving) letter to Christians living in Corinth. These metaphors operated as a broad ethical guide for describing the interrelated character of the Christian community. ‘For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one

¹⁰⁵ Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300 – 1870* (Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 21.

¹⁰⁶ Peter L. McDermott, ‘Nicholas of Cusa: Continuity and Conciliation at the Council of Basel’, *Church History*, vol. 67, no. 2 (Jun., 1998), pp. 254 – 73, here p. 259

¹⁰⁷ DEC, Vol. I, p. 407.

body, so it is with Christ.’¹⁰⁸ After framing a series of possible disputes between parts of the body—for example, the eye attempting to dispense with the hand, or the head attempting to dispense with the feet—Paul summarized his exhortation by writing, ‘Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it.’¹⁰⁹ Corporeal imagery occupied a privileged place in the Christian imaginary.

The bifurcation between ‘head and members’, which defined the council’s preferred imagery, was due to more recent developments.¹¹⁰ Three shifts were especially important. First was the belief that the pope was the *vicarius Christi* (vicar of Christ). The Latin *vicarius* means ‘substitute’ or ‘placeholder’. The title *vicarius Christi* was imperial in origin and referred to the idea, found in the Apocalypse in the New Testament, that Christ was a king who would someday return to earth and take up direct sovereignty. The monarchs of Christendom were thus placeholders, exercising Christian rule until the time that Christ returned. In the mid-eleventh century, the monk Peter Damian used this imperial title to describe the papacy, and others soon followed suit. Slowly but decisively, the title *vicarius Christi* became part of papal self-understanding, and beginning in the early twelfth century, it was applied by some authors to the papacy in an exclusive sense.¹¹¹ A second key shift occurred later in the twelfth century during the pontificate of Innocent III. One of the greatest canon lawyers of the day, Innocent sought to define the parameters of papal authority. Building upon the belief that the pope was the *vicarius Christi*, Innocent III further described the pope as the visible head of the visible church.

Influenced by contemporary medical theory, which identified the head as seat of all power in the

¹⁰⁸ 1 Cor. 12:12.

¹⁰⁹ 1 Cor. 12:27.

¹¹⁰ Christopher M. Bellitto, ‘The Reform Context of the Great Western Schism’, in Rollo-Koster and Izbicki (eds.), *A Companion to the Great Western Schism*, pp. 303 – 31, here pp. 303 – 5; Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition*, pp. 22 – 31, 66 – 81; Philip H. Stump, *The Reforms of the Council of Constance (1414 – 1418)* (Brill, 1994), p. 237 – 9.

¹¹¹ Agostino Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope’s Body*, trans. David S. Peterson (The University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 58 – 9.

human body, under Innocent III physiological imagery became an important facet of papal theology. In one of his sermons on the priesthood, Innocent observed that ‘the fullness of all the senses exists as in the head, while in the other members [of the body] there is only a part of the fullness.’¹¹² He applied this to the church and described the papal head as having *plenitudo potestatis*, the ‘plenitude of power’ in the church.¹¹³ The pope’s language did not mean that the pope could do whatever he wanted, but that just like other living bodies, the ecclesial body operated in a particular way. No body exists without a head.

Finally, in his 1302 bull *Unam Sanctam*, Pope Boniface VIII brought these two metaphors together by articulating an especially demanding vision of papal authority. Like Innocent III, Boniface VIII presumed that the church was a single body with a single head. The church, he wrote, ‘represents one mystical body whose head is Christ, while the head of Christ is God.’¹¹⁴ As the visible head of the visible church, the pope was ‘the vicar of Christ’ for all Christians on earth.¹¹⁵ From these claims, Boniface VIII deduced that the pope was not only necessary for the church, but for the salvation promised by Christ. The pope concluded his bull in the most uncompromising of terms: ‘we declare, state, define and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.’¹¹⁶ As the placeholder for Christ, who would someday have total spiritual dominion, the pope was responsible for wielding the same until Christ’s return. Such dominion could no more be divided than a body could be decapitated. Predicated upon a basic biological datum, the apostle Paul’s

¹¹² Innocent III, ‘On the Consecration of the Supreme Pontiff’, in *Between God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priesthood*, trans. Corrine J. Vause and Frank C. Gardiner (The Catholic University of America Press, 2004), pp. 23 – 4; on Innocent III and medical theory, see Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope’s Body*, pp. 179 – 80, 186 – 8.

¹¹³ Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope’s Body*, p. 60;

¹¹⁴ Boniface VIII, *Unam Sanctam*, in Brian Tierney (ed.), *The Crisis of Church and State 1050 – 1300* (University of Toronto Press and the Medieval Academy of America, 1988), p. 188.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 189.

application of ancient political thought to an early Christian community subsequently animated an extensive body of theological reflection.

Appeals to corporeal unity were appeals for spiritual order. Opposite this was the concept of monstrosity—a body physically disordered or deformed in some way. When Boniface VIII wrote about the unity of the church in *Unam Sanctam*, he contrasted it with monstrosity: ‘there is one body and one head...not two heads as though it [the church] were a monster’.¹¹⁷ The late-thirteenth century pope Gregory X thought similarly, writing of the papacy that ‘such a lofty hierarchy cannot be headless, as though it were a monster.’¹¹⁸ The fear of monstrosity was a fear of social disorder. It could also be fear of divine judgment. As we will see in later chapters, Christians of otherwise very diverse theological convictions were equally convinced that visible signs and wonders in the natural order often indicated that divine judgment was impending. The births of deformed children or animals, like the appearance of comets or other unusual cosmological phenomena, were ripe for apocalyptic interpretation.¹¹⁹ Just as the bodies of the church and the state were anatomized with particular meaning, so too were the bodies of disabled infants. Purportedly headless newborns were especially disconcerting. Deformity carried meaning and indicated that God expected repentance. When the Council of Constance called for future councils to reform ‘what is deformed’, its language was prescriptive as much as it was descriptive.¹²⁰ The reformation of the church was an urgent necessity.

The decrees promulgated by Constance connected reformation with a wide range of concepts and topics. The first session (16 November 1414) connected reformation with

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 188

¹¹⁸ Cited in Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope’s Body*, p. 146.

¹¹⁹ Lorraine Daston and Katharine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150–1750* (Zone Books, 1998), 173–214.

¹²⁰ DEC, Vol. I, p. 438.

tranquility,¹²¹ and the third session (26 March 1415) connected it with unity.¹²² At its third session, the council also specified that reformation in head and members required both moral and spiritual reformation among all Christians.¹²³ The council soon also connected reformation with a particular view of authority. On 6 April 1415, the fifth session of Constance passed *Haec Sancta*, one of the council's most important, influential, and ultimately controversial decrees. It declared that the council had 'power immediately from Christ, and that everyone of whatever state or dignity, even papal, is bound to obey it in those matters which pertain to the faith, and the eradication of the said schism.'¹²⁴ Was this intended to be a constitutional and thus permanent statement concerning the authority of all councils, or was it instead intended as an emergency measure? This became a matter of acute debate twenty years later at the Council of Basel, and the matter has never been settled. *Haec Sancta* responded to recent events. Shortly after the council began, it was almost immediately derailed by the sudden and unexpected flight of Pope John XXIII from Constance. In the absence of papal headship, the council justified its existence by appealing to divine authority, and in its decree used the same uncompromising language that had long been part of papal declarations. The council deposed John XXIII at its twelfth session (29 May 1415); at its fourteenth session (4 July 1415), it accepted the abdication of the Roman pope Gregory XII; and, at its thirty-seventh session (26 July 1417), it deposed Benedict XIII, the pope in Avignon. Aspiring to tranquility, unity, and orthodoxy, Constance showed that reformation could be the work of a council without the papacy.

Some national delegations brought proposals for reform with them to the council. One of the most extensive, the *Articles Concerning the Reformation of the Entire Church*, came from the

¹²¹ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 405.

¹²² Ibid., Vol. I, p. 407.

¹²³ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 407.

¹²⁴ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 408.

University of Oxford. It addressed forty-six individual matters.¹²⁵ The articles were ordered to first address the head and then the members of the church. The first article pertained to the pope. The university urged him that, ‘as in a true likeness, the whole body of Christians may be reunited as the members of the body in one true head’.¹²⁶ The second article pertained to the cardinals, and the five subsequent articles to things that they and the papacy could both affect. In the eighth article, the university turned to bishops and clergy, and through article twenty-five made proposals about matters in their care. Beginning with article twenty-six, a variety of matters in need of reform were discussed. Some were of local concern, such as article thirty-one, which asked the council to help determine the relationship between the churches of Canterbury and York. Others were more general, such as article twenty-seven, which asked the council to make determinations on the baptizing of non-Christians. Several of the articles touched upon matters that were not only important to Constance, but which remained important well into the following century. Article eight complained of the excessive fees charged by the Roman curia for a variety of matters, such as ‘letters of indulgence, absolutions, favors, provisions’, alleging that ‘since all these things are judged for sale, they are all suspected of having been distorted by simony’.¹²⁷ At Constance, the committee in charge of dealing with indulgences was headed by the bishop of Bath and Wells, Nicholas Bubbewyth, and the committee showed considerable willingness to reject most—but not all—indulgences.¹²⁸ The indulgences given during the recent schism were an especial target, but the outcome of these discussions is regrettably unknown; the

¹²⁵ Stump, *The Reforms of the Council of Constance*, pp. 148 – 9; the *Articles* may be found in David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, Four Vols. (London, 1737), Vol. III, pp. 360 – 5.

¹²⁶ Wilkins, *Concilia*, p. 361; ‘si per eam verisimiliter, tanquam membra in uno vero capite, possent cuncti christicolae reuniri.’

¹²⁷ Ibid.; ‘literis super indulgentiis, absolutionibus, gratiis, provisionibus...sicque omnia judicantur venalia, et de simoniaca pravitate suspecta’.

¹²⁸ Stump, *The Reforms of the Council of Constance*, pp. 67 – 72.

text of the decree has been lost.¹²⁹ Deliberations at Constance about indulgences should not be collapsed into the later Protestant rejection of them, but both responses came from the same set of convictions: the belief that indulgences tended, in the words of one committee member, ‘more to the deception and derision of the Christian people than to the salvation of souls’.¹³⁰

In addition to reforming pastoral practices and abuses, Constance also sought to define and defend orthodoxy. The council connected reformation with the ‘elimination of errors and heresies’ at its eighth session (4 May 1415), when it addressed the teachings of John Wyclif and Jan Hus.¹³¹ Drawing upon the results of an earlier condemnation by the University of Oxford, the council named fifty-eight erroneous teachings found in Wyclif’s writings. Wyclif had died in 1384, but condemning him posthumously set the stage for condemning Jan Hus, a popular priest from Bohemia, who had adopted some of Wyclif’s ideas. By turning to the controversy in Bohemia, Constance stepped right into the middle of a tense political situation that perfectly illustrated the political chaos that followed in the wake of the 1378 schism.¹³² Before the Council of Pisa, Prague had been divided over which pope it would give allegiance to, but in 1410, The Bohemian king Václav IV gave his allegiance to John XXIII in Pisa. However, Zbyněk Zajíc, the Archbishop of Prague, remained loyal to Gregory XII in Rome. Hus took the king’s side, and the archbishop, who had previously supported Hus, turned against him. The archbishop’s stated reason was Hus’ defense and advocacy of Wyclif’s theology. Hus in turn defied the archbishop with a militant summons, telling his supporters that ‘The time has come for us, just as it did for Moses in the Old Testament, to take up our swords and defend the law of God.’¹³³ Matters deteriorated after the archbishop placed Prague under an interdict that the king, who now

¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 70.

¹³⁰ Cited in Ibid.

¹³¹ DEC, Vol. I, p. 411.

¹³² Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Ashgate, 1998), pp. 65ff.

¹³³ Cited in Ibid., p. 72.

explicitly took Hus' side, defied. When the archbishop unexpectedly passed away, the matter seemed settled, but Hus' theology remained controversial. He was summoned to Constance and promised safe conduct, but upon arriving was thrown in prison. When the council followed its condemnation of Wyclif with a condemnation of Hus, it was equally concerned with Hus' theology and his call to arms, and described his teaching as 'scandalous, offensive to the ears of the devout, rash and seditious'.¹³⁴ Hus refused to recant, the council refused his attempt at self-defense, and after being excommunicated Hus was burnt at the stake on 6 July 1415. Ironically, given its ideals, this would be one of the council's most bitter and longest-lasting legacies.

In its last months, the council made provisions for securing a more conciliar and coherent future. On 9 October 1417, the date of its thirty-ninth session, Constance promulgated the decree *Frequens*, which called for general councils to be held regularly. The next council was to be held five years after the conclusion of Constance, with subsequent councils held every ten years after that.¹³⁵ In the event of a new schism—and *Frequens* had defined schism with explicit reference to the existence of two or more claimants to the papal throne—the council was to be held one year earlier.¹³⁶ In the opening lines of *Frequens*, the priority of reformation was expressed through word play; the verb *reformare* ('to reform') was presented as the means of fixing whatever deformed the church. 'The frequent holding of general councils is a pre-eminent means of cultivating the Lord's patrimony. It roots out the briars, thorns and thistles of heresies, errors and schisms, corrects deviations, reforms [*reformat*] what is deformed [*deformata*] and produces a richly fertile crop for the Lord's vineyard.'¹³⁷ At its fortieth session (30 October 1417), Constance turned its attention to the election of a new pope. Great weight was placed upon the

¹³⁴ DEC, Vol. I, p. 428.

¹³⁵ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 439.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 438.

election because the council hoped that ‘a secure, true, full and perfect union of the faithful may result from it.’¹³⁸ The new pope would be ‘the vicar of Jesus Christ, the successor of the blessed Peter, the governor of the universal church and the leader of the Lord’s flock’.¹³⁹ After the election of Martin V as pope, the penultimate session of the council decreed that the pope and council had together designated Pavia as the site of the next council. It appeared in the spring of 1418 that the council had been largely successful. Reformation, having been secured at Constance, now fell under the oversight of Martin V and the forthcoming council in Pavia, which was scheduled to convene in 1423.

III.

But in 1420, the western church split—or at least a part of it did. King Václav of Bohemia died the previous year without children. His brother Sigismund, the king of Hungary and arguably the most important political supporter of the Council of Constance, was next in line to inherit the crown—but the Bohemians did not want a Hungarian on the throne. Furthermore, the burning of Hus had outraged many Bohemians, who came to consider him a martyr and a saint. A small group of Bohemians gathered together in the city of Tábor in 1420, where they elected their own bishop and began holding religious services, and this inspired similar communities to begin forming throughout southern Bohemia. When Sigismund attempted to take the throne by force, he was repulsed by the Bohemian general Jan Žižka, who emerged as the principal defender of what had become a theopolitical movement. The ‘Hussites’, as they were soon called, were united around the memory of Hus and were intensely committed to both Bohemian political autonomy and to utraquism (receiving both the bread and the wine of the

¹³⁸ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 445.

¹³⁹ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 446.

Eucharist). The origins of utraquist practice in Bohemia are unclear, but it did not begin with the Hussites. Traditionally, the laity received only the consecrated bread of the Eucharist, and this only on Easter each year; but in 1391, frequent communion for the laity was synodically established in Prague, and may have involved reception in both kinds.¹⁴⁰ From prison in Constance, Hus wrote in support of utraquism; the Hussites maintained this practice and made the chalice their symbol. Žižka referred to himself as ‘Jan Žižka of the chalice’,¹⁴¹ and Hussite military banners consistently displayed the chalice as well.¹⁴² The Hussites set forth their major grievances in the Four Articles of Prague. They demanded free preaching of the Word of God, that the bread and wine be received in both kinds, that clergy and the church not possess any property, and that public sin would be punished without regard to estate.¹⁴³ Rooted in Hus’ execution, Hussite theology and rebellion sowed seeds of discord in the recently pruned vineyard of Christendom.

None of the subsequent fifteenth-century councils proved to be anything like Constance. The council of 1423 lasted less than a year. Few arrived for its opening, and due to an outbreak of plague, it was quickly relocated from Pavia to Siena. The council was defined by conflict between itself and Martin V, who refused to attend, and by the conflict in Bohemia. Taking the side of Sigismund, the council advocated starving the Bohemians into submission.¹⁴⁴ After only a few months, Pavia-Siena dissolved itself on February 20, and called for a new council to meet in Basel in 1431.¹⁴⁵ Unlike Constance but like Pavia, Basel was also not well attended. The first English delegation arrived in 1432 but left the following year; a second delegation arrived in

¹⁴⁰ Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride*, pp. 49 – 59.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 107.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 146.

¹⁴³ In Thomas A. Fudge (trans. and ed.), *The Crusade against the Heretics in Bohemia, 1418 – 1437* (Ashgate, 2002), pp. 83 – 4.

¹⁴⁴ Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride*, p. 90 n. 98.

¹⁴⁵ See especially William Patrick Hyland, ‘Reform Preaching and Despair at the Council of Pavia-Siena (1423 – 1424)’, *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 84, no. 3 (Jul., 1998), pp. 409 – 430.

1434 but left in 1435.¹⁴⁶ The English attended sporadically because of the constant conflict between the new pope Eugenius IV and the council. One element of conflict centered on authority. Basel maintained much of Constance's vocabulary, invoking *Frequens* at its first session (14 December 1431) and *Haec Sancta* at its second (29 April 1432). When describing the state of the church, Basel similarly employed several of the same metaphors that Constance had used, portraying the church both as a vineyard and as a body.¹⁴⁷ Basel called for reformation 'in head and members',¹⁴⁸ for the defense of orthodoxy, and for the pacification of Christendom. The last of these was a reference to the Hussites, with whom the council proactively pursued negotiations. But Eugenius IV, continuing work begun by Martin V, wanted to restore communion with the Greeks.¹⁴⁹ The council foundered on this division, and in the process gave rise to new theories about ecclesial leadership.

Sigismund, who became Holy Roman Emperor on 31 May 1433, took up a mediating role in these conflicts.¹⁵⁰ He supported the council in part because he was at war with the Hussites, but he also wanted to avoid another schism. Sigismund urged the council to not depose Eugenius, and further encouraged them to try and reach a compromise with him.¹⁵¹ One of the most significant developments to come out of these arguments was *The Catholic Concordance* by Nicholas of Cusa. He offered a new vision of the relationship between the papal and imperial crowns by giving the emperor a key role to play in the work of reformation. *The Catholic Concordance* was, in many ways, a defense of Sigismund's own defense of Basel. In the second book, which pertained to councils, Cusa wrote that in the early church, 'universal councils were

¹⁴⁶ A. N. E. D. Schofield, 'England, the Pope, and the Council of Basel, 1435 – 1449', *Church History*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (Sept., 1964), pp. 248 – 278.

¹⁴⁷ DEC, Vol. 1, p. 456.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 455, 457.

¹⁴⁹ Michiel Decaluwe, *A Successful Defeat: Eugene IV's Struggle with the Council of Basel for Ultimate Authority in the Church, 1431 – 1449* (Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 2009), p. 69.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 142 – 6.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 162 – 3.

assembled by the emperors to discuss articles of faith, with the consent of the Roman pontiff and of the other patriarchs.’¹⁵² Therefore, just as ancient councils were under imperial oversight, so too was the council in Basel. Cusa advocated giving back to the emperor the title that had long since been reserved for the papacy: *vicarius Christi*. As if working backwards through history, Cusa first denied that the pope had plenitude of power.¹⁵³ He based his argument on the New Testament, where no executive power was ever given to Peter. ‘Therefore’, Cusa argued, ‘all the apostles are equal to Peter in power.’¹⁵⁴ In *The Catholic Concordance*, Cusa never directly described the pope as the vicar of Christ but only noted that others have described him this way.¹⁵⁵ Although he described Peter as the vicar of Christ, and although he also described the papacy as the representative of Peter, he never connected these points together by explicitly designating the pope *vicarius Christi*.¹⁵⁶ With the hierarchy of the church effectively flattened at the level of the episcopate, Cusa proposed that the authority of the emperor was not mediated through the pope but was instead received directly from God, making the emperor ‘the vicar of Christ’.¹⁵⁷ The emperor was ‘first over all other princes because he rules in subordination to Christ, victorious and triumphant, and subjects himself by faith to Christ and his laws.’¹⁵⁸ Cusa concluded his work by exhorting Sigismund to secure ‘peace in the church’, telling him, ‘We wait for you eagerly, father of all, to initiate and carry forth this most happy deed in our time.’¹⁵⁹

The Catholic Concordance advocated imperial reformation in all but name.

Basel’s negotiations with the Hussites centered on the *Compactata*, an agreement proposed between the Hussites and legates of the council. First proposed in 1433, it was accepted

¹⁵² Nicholas of Cusa, *The Catholic Concordance*, II.VI, para. 85 (p. 63).

¹⁵³ Ibid., II.XIII, esp. paras. 112 – 16 (pp. 88 – 92).

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., II. XIII, para. 115 (p. 90).

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., II.XVII, para. 145 (p. 111).

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., II. XVII, paras. 145 – 6 (pp. 111 – 12), II.XXXIV para. 255 (p. 197).

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., III.V (pp. 233 – 4).

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., III.V, para. 342 (p. 234).

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., III.LI, para. 597 (p. 322).

by the Hussites and Sigismund in 1436 and by the council in 1437.¹⁶⁰ It allowed preaching and utraquism, but required clergy to affirm transubstantiation; this had been the orthodox doctrine in the church since the early thirteenth century and held that in the Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ were present under the form of the consecrated bread and wine. The *Compactata* rejected the Hussites' belief that clergy and the church should own no property, and it restricted the punishment of public sins to the civil authority, while agreeing that estate should not mitigate legal penalties. In 1437, the schism ended, and most Bohemians were restored to the communion of the Catholic Church. A small number of Bohemians remained in schism, but their movement died out by the late 1450s. The council, which shared the pope's desire for reunion with the eastern churches, could now turn its attention to the Greeks. At its nineteenth session on 7 September 1434, the council had stated its desire to resolve its 'ancient discord' with the church in the east, decreeing that 'union is only possible in a universal synod in which both the western church and the eastern church meet'.¹⁶¹ Unknowingly, both the council and the papacy each sent their own envoys to work out a time and place for when they might meet with the Greeks, and the conflicting results of these delegations only revived the argument about whether the pope or the council should have priority.¹⁶² Sigismund sided with the council, but a small group of bishops sided with the pope, and less than a month after Sigismund's death on 9 December 1437, the council split. Some bishops joined Eugenius, while others remained at Basel. As a concession to the Greeks, Eugenius transferred his new council from Basel, first to Ferrara, then to Florence, and finally to Rome. This made the location of the new council progressively closer to Constantinople and eventually also placed it in the heart of the papal territories.

¹⁶⁰ In Fudge, *The Crusade against the Heretics in Bohemia, 1418 – 1437*, pp. 368 – 72.

¹⁶¹ DEC, Vol. I, p. 478.

¹⁶² Decaluwe, *A Successful Defeat*, pp. 210 – 15.

One of the most influential accounts of the split of Basel was *Two Books of Commentary on the Council of Basel* (Latin, *De Gestis Concilii Basiliensis Commentariorum Libri II*), written by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who later became pope Pius II. The division of the council was followed by a considerable political shakeup. The English absented themselves with the argument that church councils depend upon the pope just as parliaments depend upon kings,¹⁶³ but members of the Italian, French, German, and Spanish delegations attended the continuing council.¹⁶⁴ The Germans occupied a middle ground, variously attempting to mediate between the pope and Basel while also supporting the continuing council's decisions. Although not crowned by the pope, Albert, the successor to Sigismund, acceded to the throne of the Holy Roman Empire in 1438; he, too, supported the council, and so did the imperial electors.¹⁶⁵ As the split devolved into a full-blown schism, Basel suffered considerable attrition and left a legacy that ultimately did considerable harm to advocates of conciliar primacy. But attrition was not necessarily from one side to the other. The English did not attend the pope's council. Some of this was due to circumstance; the papal envoy who carried the pope's invitation was kidnapped *en route*.¹⁶⁶ Some of this was also due to a refusal to side either with the pope against the emperor, or with the emperor against the pope.¹⁶⁷ The division of 1437 was threefold, but instead of being between three popes, it was between the pope, the emperor, and those who wished to remain neutral.

¹⁶³ A. J. Black, *Monarchy and Community: Political Ideas in the Later Conciliar Controversy 1430 – 1450* (Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 115.

¹⁶⁴ Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *De Gestis Concilii Basiliensis Commentariorum Libri II*, ed. and trans. Denys Hay and W. K. Smith, rev. ed. (Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 211 – 19.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 15.

¹⁶⁶ Margaret Harvey, *England, Rome and the Papacy 1417 – 1464: The Study of a Relationship* (Manchester University Press, 1993), p. 86.

¹⁶⁷ For a general overview, see *Idem.*, 'England, the Council of Florence and the end of the Council of Basel', in Giuseppe Alberigo (ed.), *Christian Unity: The Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438/39 – 1989* (Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 203 – 225.

Divided from the pope but without a pope of its own, the continuing council of Basel had to determine what the source of its authority was. Like Nicholas of Cusa in *The Catholic Concordance*, Alfonso Garcia, the bishop of Burgos and royal ambassador of Juan II, king of Castile, believed that the pope was but one bishop among many. He elaborated that ‘for a king to have more power than the whole of the kingdom is absurd; therefore the pope should not have more power than the Church.’¹⁶⁸ Piccolomini took the same view and buttressed it with page after page of Biblical exegesis,¹⁶⁹ but at the conclusion of these glosses he offered a new conception of the papacy and denied the strict validity of corporeal descriptions of the church. Advocates of papal headship argued that the ecclesial body must always endure its papal head, but Piccolomini countered, ‘if we wish to argue like this, that the ecclesiastical head should be on the same terms with its body as the human head with its body, it will follow inevitably that on the death of the head the body dies too, as we see happening with human bodies’.¹⁷⁰ But this was not the case, as the church outlived each successive pope. ‘Whatever some may say, I do not agree with those who term the Roman pontiff head of the church, unless perhaps the administrative head, for we read that Christ is the head of the church, not the pope, and that is the true head, unchangeable, perpetual, and eternal.’¹⁷¹ This kind of logic laid the groundwork for the deposition of Eugenius IV, which the continuing council soon pursued in earnest.

De Gestis witnessed to another series of arguments about authority in the church. What role were princes supposed to play in councils and ecclesiastical governance? Royal ambassadors, having initially sought to reunite the pope with the council, now sought to prevent Eugenius IV’s deposition, and their failed intervention occasioned considerable debate. No clear doctrine of

¹⁶⁸ Piccolomini, *De Gestis*, p. 33.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., pp. 35 – 53.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 67 – 9.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 69.

royal authority emerged from the council of Basel, although some attendees held that Christian princes could have a role in calling councils. This belief worked in two ways. On the one hand, Piccolomini used it to undermine papal authority. The pro-papal position held that ‘general councils are of no efficacy and importance at all unless the Roman pontiff has called them into being, and his authority has continued in them.’¹⁷² Piccolomini countered this, first by noting that the apostolic council in Acts was not called by Peter, and then by noting that the ecumenical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries were called by the emperors. When emperors had called councils, ‘the agreement of the Roman pope was not particularly sought for’.¹⁷³ The lack of consistent historical precedent served to vindicate the argument that popes did not have more power than councils. On the other hand, some attendees sought to give princes a stronger position of influence, even if not an official vote at the council. The Sicilian canonist Panormitanus supported the princes’ call for not passing a verdict upon Eugenius, but was attacked for his position by Louis, cardinal of Arles. The cardinal countered that among princes, political considerations should take a back seat to matters of faith, and that the council, as the representative body of the wider church, was the final arbiter in contested matters.¹⁷⁴ Piccolomini records that two parties soon developed, the first around Panormitanus and the second around Louis. Frustrated, Panormitanus soon left the council, which only emboldened those who saw a firm divide between conciliar and royal authority. Summarizing a speech then given by the cardinal of Arles, Piccolomini wrote, ‘The Church would not tolerate its affairs and matters of faith being decided by the judgment of the princes.’¹⁷⁵ Imperial reformation was thus

¹⁷² Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 83.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 109.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 177.

circumscribed at the continuing council of Basel. This also meant that the council would finally proceed with the excommunication of Eugenius IV, who was deposed on 25 June 1439.

The condemnation and excommunication of Eugenius did not cause the council of Basel to deny the need for some sort of papal headship, and it soon set about to securing the election of a new pope. Amadeus of Savoy soon emerged as the lead candidate, but his popularity brought an unexpected debate to the fore: whether clergy could be married. Amadeus was a widower whose wife had died in 1422, and some at the council argued that this disqualified him from holding the papal office. Piccolomini briefly considered the matter. He countered in *De Gestis* that this argument against Amadeus was ‘of no importance, since not only a widower, but a man with a living wife can be chosen [as pope].’ After all, he continued, ‘there were several married pontiffs, and Peter, the head of the apostles, was not without a wife. Why do we raise such objections now?’¹⁷⁶ Piccolomini did not go into as much detail on this issue, but he briefly considered the implications of his argument for the wider church, musing that ‘Perhaps it would not be worse for as many priests as possible to take a wife, since many would be saved in a married priesthood who are damned in one that is celibate.’¹⁷⁷ This was not a celebration of sexuality, but simply the traditional view that marriage provided the only avenue for licit sexual expression that did not endanger the soul. His considerations of married clergy were brief, and ended with Piccolomini promising further discussion ‘at another time.’¹⁷⁸ And so, having just been reunited with the Bohemians, the western church split again with the election of Amadeus as pope Felix V in 1439. The schism lasted for a decade.

The distance that lay between the councils of Basel and Ferrara-Florence-Rome can be read in ideological and not just geographical terms. The two councils had fundamentally

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 247 – 9.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 249.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

different convictions about their authority, with the former emphasizing the primacy of councils and the latter the papacy. The decrees of Eugenius' council quickly elevated the papacy to a position of primary importance. The second session at Ferrara inverted the formula that adorned most of Basel's decrees and introduced the new council by claiming that 'This holy universal synod, through the grace of God authorized by the most blessed lord pope Eugenius IV, legitimately assembled in the Holy Spirit in this city of Ferrara, represents the universal church.'¹⁷⁹ Beginning with the third session, the decrees opened with 'Eugenius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, for an everlasting record.'¹⁸⁰ The council that began at Ferrara rapidly reassembled the high papal doctrine that Constance and Basel had rejected. At the sixth session in Florence, which secured reunion with the Greeks, it was decreed that 'the Roman pontiff holds the primacy over the whole world' and that 'he is the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church and the father and teacher of all Christians'.¹⁸¹ The conditions of unity which Eugenius and his supporters placed upon the other eastern churches were no less papalist, and each was required to give its assent to the plenitude of papal power.¹⁸²

The Council of Ferrara-Florence-Rome was just as far from Basel in its approach to reformation. Comparing the two councils, one finds different vocabularies at work. Ferrara-Florence-Rome did not broach the topic of reformation until its seventh session on 7 September 1439, which condemned the continuing council of Basel. A piece of remarkable invective, this decree responded to Basel's recent excommunication of Eugenius IV by describing it as 'the abominable crime that certain wicked men dwelling in Basel have plotted in these days so as to

¹⁷⁹ DEC, Vol. I, p. 514.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 517.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 528.

¹⁸² Ibid., e.g., pp. 557 – 8, 581.

breach the unity of holy church'.¹⁸³ Among other crimes and errors, those at Basel were further accused of 'impiety', 'tyranny', and 'every stain of corruption',¹⁸⁴ and their actions were depicted as occurring 'under the cloak of reform [reformationis], which in truth they have always abhorred'.¹⁸⁵ Basel soon provided other opportunities for papal resentment. Because it deposed Eugenius IV, Basel initiated ecclesial division—a division that it soon exacerbated by electing Felix V as its own pope, thus returning papal schism to the landscape of western Christendom. Eugenius countered, and not unfairly, that this was antithetical to the work of Constance, but rather than repudiate the first conciliar council, the Council of Ferrara-Florence-Rome reclaimed it by yoking Constance to the cause of reunion with the eastern churches.¹⁸⁶ At its ninth session, which decreed against Felix V, the pope's council endorsed a petition that described Felix V 'that first-born son of Satan',¹⁸⁷ and his supporters as 'profaners'.¹⁸⁸ Against Basel stood 'the sacrament of unity' and 'the holy general Council of Constance'.¹⁸⁹ None of this yielded a positive definition of reformation, but by invoking the memory of Constance, Ferrara-Florence-Rome appealed to common ground that lay between Basel and itself. The great difference was that the papal council now identified itself as the true inheritor of Constance, especially its work of healing and pacifying Christendom.

Reformation was not discussed again by Ferrara-Florence-Rome until the twelfth of its fourteen sessions. In the first of its decrees passed in Rome, this session stated that the council was moved for the third and final time so that it could accomplish 'the extirpation of heresies and

¹⁸³ Ibid., p. 529.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 531.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 533.

¹⁸⁷ DEC, Vol. 1, p. 562.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 565.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 561.

errors, the reform of morals, the peace, salvation and increase of the Christian people'.¹⁹⁰ In this decree, the 'mystical body' of Christ was invoked alongside 'the unity and peace of the Christian people', and the latter was detailed with reference to the newly restored relations between Rome and the eastern churches.¹⁹¹ As already noted, such imagery and its attendant assumptions were ubiquitous, but this did not make Ferrara-Florence-Rome a thematic continuation of what transpired at Basel between 1431 and 1437. In the decrees of Ferrara-Florence-Rome, corporeal metaphors were quite rare and their use pointed not to the work of a council but to the work of the papacy. Basel and Rome were truly a world apart. By the mid-1440s, the Eugenic minority of 1437 had become a majority as bishops travelled not just from Basel, but towards some form of Eugenic papalism. Healing the schism with the Greeks and the other eastern churches proved itself an immense draw for those whose sympathies were otherwise conciliar. Eugenius appeared as an apostle of concord. Although the eastern churches eventually rejected the papal terms of reunification, when the Council of Ferrara-Florence-Rome concluded in 1445, it appeared that a long-unprecedented level of unity had indeed returned—and this without conciliar reformation.

IV.

The years between 1414, when Constance began, and 1449, when the schism at Basel ended, were as tumultuous as the decades that followed the schism of 1378. At the extreme end of the conciliarist spectrum were those like Juan de Segovia, who wrote several works in the 1450s that explicitly compared Eugenius IV with Lucifer.¹⁹² Conciliarist and reformist sentiment became increasingly diffuse in the latter half of the fifteenth century, although each remained

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 586.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 584.

¹⁹² Jesse D. Mann, 'The Devilish Pope: Eugenius IV as Lucifer in the Later Works of Juan de Segovia', *Church History*, vol. 65, no. 2 (Jun., 1996), pp. 184 – 96.

part of the broader ecclesiastical landscape. None of Eugenius IV's successors sought to aid or work within the bounds of conciliarist thought, and despite *Frequens*, no council was called again until 1511—and it was called by Louis XII, king of France. With the fall of Constantinople in 1453, several popes sought, albeit unsuccessfully, to lead a crusade against Mehmed II 'the Conqueror', sultan of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁹³ Although such calls never amounted to much, they enhanced the political import of the papacy. Just as crusading was an important element in the eleventh-century rise of papal influence, it was also tied to the growth of papal authority in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. But instead of seeing the growth of absolute papal allegiance, the latter half of the fifteenth century saw a crumbling of consensus about authority in the church.

The breakdown of Basel and the legend of Sigismund became intertwined through the *Reformatio Sigismundi* (The Reformation of Sigismund), an anonymously-authored work that claimed to have been influenced by Sigismund's own plan for reformation of both the church and the Empire.¹⁹⁴ *Reformatio Sigismundi* is dated to shortly after Sigismund's death. It proved popular with seventeen manuscripts having survived, eight of which were printed between 1476 and 1522.¹⁹⁵ The title and the content of the work both indicate that by the time of his death, Sigismund had become a figure of immense influence, and that some had begun to credit him alone with restoring the unity of the church. In the opening section, the author wrote, 'Our lord the Emperor Sigismund, seeking ways and means of preventing such terrible abuses in Christendom, summoned the Council of Constance, which brought about a reunion of the

¹⁹³ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A Short History* (Yale University Press, 1987), pp. 235 – 40.

¹⁹⁴ In Gerald Strauss (ed. and trans.), *Manifestations of Discontent in Germany the Eve of the Reformation* (Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 3 – 31; for the German text, see Heinrich Koller (ed.), *Reformation Kaiser Siegmunds* (Stuttgart, 1964).

¹⁹⁵ Strauss, *Manifestations*, p. 4.

divided papacy. He also charged the Council to undertake a reformation.¹⁹⁶ The same claim was repeated near the end of the work.¹⁹⁷ However, the author continued, the wider church—especially the bishops and the papacy—spurned the emperor’s pious lead, and because of their impiety, the reformation intended at Basel had failed.

Drawing upon corporeal metaphors, the author began the text with a discussion of the papacy, offering a declension narrative: ‘If the Roman court were in good and proper state, as it used to be in the old days, all Christendom would be in better order. When corruption overtakes the head, it must spread to all other members.’¹⁹⁸ Like the English at Constance, the author alleged that simony touched most indulgence payments;¹⁹⁹ it was then further alleged that the papal court charged illegal fees for copies of official documents,²⁰⁰ and that the papacy allowed monasteries to exploit widows and orphans.²⁰¹ Reformation of the papacy was therefore paramount. Having begun with the head, *Reformatio Sigismundi* moved on to the principal members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, particularly the bishops. They too fared badly. The author made numerous demands here as well, calling for bishops to hold annual synods with their diocesan clergy, to make the liturgy uniform,²⁰² and to reside in their diocesan cathedrals instead of castles.²⁰³ Working through the ecclesial body, the text addressed two already familiar issues: the education of clergy, itself a longstanding concern, and clerical marriage. The author correlated the church’s hierarchy with educational requirements, advocating that ‘The parish priest must be, at the very least, a *baccalarius*; a cardinal should be a doctor of laws and of

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., pp. 9 – 10.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 6.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

²⁰¹ Ibid., p. 24.

²⁰² Ibid., p. 13.

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 11.

Scripture; a bishop should be a doctor of Scripture and a scholar in theology and canon law.’²⁰⁴

This emphasis upon Scripture is notable given erroneous but widespread assumptions that sixteenth-century evangelicals were unique in their emphasis upon Holy Writ. No less important are the images of restoration found elsewhere in the text, which evangelicals of a later era also used but did not originate.

Reformatio Sigismundi discussed renewal in two ways. On the one hand, it advocated the marriage of clergy as the heart of parochial renewal. The author laid out a detailed plan for giving each parish two priests, which ‘ought to be done to restore parish churches to proper order.’²⁰⁵ Each priest would have the same pay for the same work, and each would also be allowed to marry. Noting that ‘Christ himself never forbade marriage’, the author claimed that ‘great evils’ had arisen since the imposition of celibacy, such as sodomy, concubinage, and the willingness of bishops to charge a fee for turning a blind eye to the latter. The author further claimed that enforced celibacy had also eroded the relationship between clergy and laity,²⁰⁶ a state of affairs that would change only when clergy were allowed to marry. This too was not a celebration of sexuality. Perhaps reflecting the Levitical separation between sexual activity and worship, the author explained that the two parish priests would celebrate the Mass on alternate Sundays: ‘During this week he may not lie with his wife. On the Saturday on which his week begins he must purify himself with confession and washing his body in the bath.’²⁰⁷ It is important that this discussion not be portrayed as ‘foreshadowing’ later, sixteenth-century debates on the same topic; by imposing a historical teleology, such a descriptive metaphor

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 12.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 14.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 15.

misleads. Rather, it should be recognized that sixteenth-century debates about the marriage of clergy were simply inherited because well developed in the previous century.

On the other hand, *Reformatio Sigismundi* contained several passages that mixed apocalyptic prophecy with a monarchical messianism. The text drew upon the centuries-old myth that the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (c. 1122 – 1190), who died on crusade, would someday return and restore the political order of the Holy Roman Empire.²⁰⁸ These legends were sometimes anti-papal,²⁰⁹ although *Reformatio Sigismundi* did not go so far as to claim that the future Frederick would overthrow the papacy. The text instead called for a future emperor who would also be a priest. This personal union of imperial with sacerdotal offices was not unknown in earlier Christian history, but it had been the key point of debate between the emperor Henry IV and the Gregorian reformers during the Investiture controversy of the eleventh century. The papacy claimed that monarchs were laity and that they had no right to celebrate the sacraments, as was done in France and England, or to appoint bishops within their kingdoms, as was done in Germany and elsewhere. This caused immense controversy at the time and created a fundamental and unresolved divide between those who adhered to papal primacy in the western church and those who sought greater monarchical control.

Reformatio Sigismundi justified its advocacy of a sacerdotal emperor by appealing to Melchisedek,²¹⁰ the Biblical priest-king who blessed the patriarch Abraham and was held by the earliest Christians to be a prophetic pattern for Jesus' union of these same offices. *Reformatio Sigismundi* connected the appearance of the priest-emperor with the renewal of creation, which would bring with it plentiful harvests and purified air. In the author's words, 'the golden age will

²⁰⁸ For a general overview, see Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*, revised and expanded edition (Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 108 – 26.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 118.

²¹⁰ Strauss, *Manifestations*, pp. 18 – 19.

return'.²¹¹ The author used the emperor Sigismund to prophesy the very name of this messianic emperor.

We affirm by our soul and by the passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ that what we are about to divulge was revealed to us in the year 1403 in Pressburg in Hungary. Toward dawn of Ascension Day, as the morning star appeared in the sky, a voice came to us saying: Sigismund arise, profess God and prepare a way for the Divine Order. Law and justice languish neglected and scorned. You yourself are not destined to accomplish the great renewal, but you will prepare a way for him who will come after you. He who will come after you is a priest through whom God will accomplish many things. He will be called Frederick of Lantneuen.²¹²

This Frederick has been identified as the priest Frederick Latnau, who attended the Council of Basel,²¹³ but the last name 'Lantnewen' is noteworthy because it also functions as a compound noun—*lant* + *newen*, or new land. With its vision of a messianic priest-king and its repeated celebrations of Sigismund's role in calling the Council of Constance, *Reformatio Sigismundi* bound reformation of the church to a divinely renewed monarchy and thus offered a vision of the imperial reformation of church, state, and creation.

Another work produced during the breakdown of Basel attacked the papacy, and unlike the *Reformatio Sigismundi* had immense influence and an international dissemination. In 1440, Lorenzo Valla published *On the Forged and Mendacious Donation of Constantine*. The Donation of Constantine is an anonymously-authored work that likely dates from the late-eighth or early-ninth century. It claimed that in the fourth century, the emperor Constantine had granted

²¹¹ Ibid., p. 28.

²¹² Ibid., pp. 30 – 1.

²¹³ Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 119; Peter G. Bietenholz, *Historia and Fabula: Myths and Legends in History Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age* (Brill, 1994), pp. 141 – 3.

the whole western half of the Roman Empire to the papacy, thereby making the pope both a political and a spiritual leader. Later incorporated into canon law, the Donation had, by Valla's time, been used for centuries as a support for the political aims of the papacy. Importantly, the text was widely believed authentic. For those who believed that the church had amassed too much wealth and power, Constantine was to blame. By giving the pope such a vast amount of land and political influence, Constantine unwittingly but fatally compromised the spiritual purity of the church.²¹⁴ The conciliarists gathered at Constance believed that the Donation of Constantine was real, and it was an integral facet of their understanding of the church; Wyclif was denounced for having rejected it.²¹⁵ The Hussites had also opposed it, as had Nicholas of Cusa in *The Catholic Concordance*.²¹⁶ But all of these figures debated a text that they believed was true, and their arguments against it were fundamentally theological. Lorenzo Valla did something new by showing that the Donation was counterfeit.²¹⁷

On the Forged and Mendacious Donation of Constantine relied upon two main arguments. The first was rhetorical and consisted of denying the wisdom of Constantine's decision to grant the whole western half of the Roman Empire to the papacy. Surely no political leader could be so foolish? Throughout his oration, Valla revealed a quick and sometimes acerbic wit, but the real contribution of his work was found in his use of historical and especially philological evidence. He showed that various details in the Donation, such as references to the

²¹⁴ See especially Robert Black, 'The Donation of Constantine: A New Source for the Concept of the Renaissance?', in Alison Brown (ed.), *Language and Images of Renaissance Italy* (Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 51 – 85.

²¹⁵ DEC, Vol. 1, p. 413, n. 33.

²¹⁶ Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride*, pp. 241, 257; Cusa, *The Catholic Concordance*, III.II, paras. 294 – 312 (pp. 216 – 222).

²¹⁷ Salvatore I. Camporeale, 'Lorenzo Valla's "Oratio" on the Pseudo-Donation of Constantine: Dissent and Innovation in Early Renaissance Humanism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 57, no. 1 (Jan., 1996), pp. 9 – 26, here pp. 14 – 16.

patrician rank and descriptions of the imperial diadem, were historically anachronistic;²¹⁸ he also drew attention to ‘linguistic barbarisms’ which indicated that the Latin used in the document was later than the Latin that Constantine had used.²¹⁹ Valla bookended his arguments with attacks on the papacy. In his opening paragraph, after describing himself as ‘one who writes not only against the dead, but against the living as well’, Valla portrayed the papacy as destructively wielding excommunication as a weapon: ‘you cannot find protection from him [the pope] by sheltering, so to speak, under the shield of any prince, to avoid being struck down by excommunication, anathema, or execration.’²²⁰ In his final pages, Valla called for the papacy to abandon its political pretensions, looking forward to a time when ‘the Pope will be called, and really be, Holy Father, father of all, father of the church. He will not provoke wars among Christians but, through apostolic censure and papal majesty, bring an end to the wars provoked by others.’²²¹ Valla’s attack upon the papacy was not a rejection of it, but as the condemnation of Wyclif and Hus showed, Valla’s argument did transgress the bounds of orthodoxy. The real impact of his work would not be felt until the sixteenth century.

Valla did not call for reformation, and the disastrous outcome of Basel made it unlikely that a council would be called in the near future, but shortly before his death Nicholas of Cusa considered the subject of reformation again. In 1459, he composed *A General Reformation of the Church*, the last of his writings concerned with reformation. *A General Reformation* was composed at the request of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who had become pope Pius II in 1458. Both the timing and the origin of his request are notable; late in life, Pius II repudiated his earlier

²¹⁸ Lorenzo Valla, *On The Donation of Constantine*, trans. G. W. Bowersock (Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 93, 91.

²¹⁹ Ibid., p. 73.

²²⁰ Ibid., p. 3.

²²¹ Valla, *On the Donation of Constantine*, p. 161; Camporeale, ‘Lorenzo Valla’s “Oratio” on the Pseudo-Donation of Constantine’, pp. 21 – 2.

participation at the Council of Basel, and in 1460, he sounded what is often considered the final death knell for conciliarism by denying that anyone could appeal to a future council against the decisions of the pope. By this point, Cusa was a cardinal and a defender of the papacy, and his work offers an excellent example of what papal reformation looked like to its proponents. Cusa's conceptual scheme was classically corporeal, and he set forth 'Christiformes', 'the form of Christ', as the model for the Church. 'This form is acquired through imitation,' he wrote,²²² specifying that moral reformation—a concern for virtue—had to be at the heart of any desire for reformation. Cusa praised and expanded the apostle Paul's comparison of the church to a human body, using the apostle's recognition of functional diversity to emphasize that 'diverse offices' in the church were 'allocated for the building up of the body.'²²³ Cusa's language misses something in translation; the Latin *diversa officia*, translated as 'diverse offices', could also be translated as 'diverse duties'. Cusa was less concerned to address particular matters than the particular responsibilities of those who held particular church offices.

Unlike earlier approaches to reformation, which began with the head, Cusa began by discussing the body—the wider Christian church. He first offered fourteen rules that he believed every future reformation should follow. These covered a variety of matters, from the devout celebration of the liturgy (the first point), to moral reformation (the second point), to the extirpation of usury, adultery, and divination (the fourteenth point). In order to accomplish these reforms he proposed the appointment of visitors, who would use his list as they traveled from church to church. Cusa's discussion of the head worked along similar lines, emphasizing moral reformation. He wrote that the College of Cardinals should maintain canonical norms, reject any and all bribes or other gifts, and strive to be exemplary in their manner of living. The same was

²²² Nicholas of Cusa, *A General Reform of the Church*, in *Writings on Church and Reform*, trans. Thomas M. Izbicki (Harvard University Press, 2008), para. 3 (p. 555).

²²³ *Ibid.*, para. 7 (p. 559).

true of the papacy. Cusa used a variety of names to describe the pope—‘father of fathers’, archbishop, bishop, and priest—but the names were joined to particular duties. ‘If we glory in all these names,’ he wrote, ‘we should strive in every way to be what we are called and to show in action what we profess to be.’²²⁴ Cusa’s general reformation was moral in nature.

Fifteenth-century debates on ecclesiastical authority were joined by debates over devotion. When Constance sought to restrain the dispensation of indulgences, it also questioned the viability of certain kinds of pilgrimage, which were often performed for the sake of securing indulgences. Pilgrimages were also made for the sake of beholding the relics of saints, which were widely believed to effect miraculous cures. Shrines became popular when they became known for healing, but this meant that relics were sometimes forged in the interest of gaining financial profit. In his *General Reformation*, Cusa addressed lay devotion by questioning the presence of relics in churches, and directed his proposed visitors ‘to examine relics and to investigate how it is known that they are true relics.’ Cusa noted that greed spurred the growth of the relic trade, and that ‘avarice often substitutes false things for true’. He did not reject relics as such, but he relegated them to a distant and secondary status. ‘It suffices for a Christian people to have Christ truly in its church in the sacrament of the divine Eucharist, in which it has all it could want for salvation. True relics may be venerated, but Christ, the head of all the saints, should be venerated much more’.²²⁵

The fifteenth century also saw a growing variety of Eucharistic practice. The Hussites made the chalice their symbol but they defended an inherited, pre-Hussite Eucharistic practice defined by utraquism and frequent lay communion. Elsewhere in Christendom, others also called for more frequent communion, even if they envisioned receiving only the bread of the Eucharist.

²²⁴ Ibid., para. 26 (p. 577).

²²⁵ Ibid., para. 22 (p. 573).

In her autobiography, the English pilgrim Margery Kempe (c. 1378 – 1438) recounted a visionary experience in which Christ appeared to her and said, ‘This is my wish, daughter, that you receive my body every Sunday, and I shall fill you with so much grace that the whole world shall marvel at it.’²²⁶ The vision proved prophetic, and later in the text, she recounted that during her pilgrimage in Rome, she ‘was received into the hospital of St. Thomas of Canterbury in Rome, and she received communion there every Sunday’.²²⁷ In some ways, Kempe’s devotional practice was like that which Cusa envisioned. She revered relics but mentioned them infrequently,²²⁸ focusing far more intently upon her deeply personal relationship with Jesus. On page after page of her autobiography, she and Jesus speak to one another. He tells her to do a variety of things, such as wear white, and she weeps when she visits the places associated with his passion. In *The Book of Margery Kempe*, frequent communion was inseparable from a Christocentric piety.

The most popular work of the fifteenth century, the *Imitatio Christi* (The Imitation of Christ) of Thomas à Kempis, continued in the same vein. It is difficult to overstress how important and popular the *Imitatio* was. It was translated into numerous European vernaculars, and between 1420 and 1650, more than 1,500 editions of the *Imitatio* circulated, whether in print or in handwritten manuscripts.²²⁹ The interrelationship of the Eucharist to Jesus’ presence was the theme of the *Imitatio*’s fourth book, a dialogue between Christ and the otherwise unnamed ‘Disciple’. In England and elsewhere, the fourth book sometimes circulated independently,

²²⁶ Margery Kempe, *The Book of Margery Kempe*, trans. Anthony Bale (Oxford University Press, 2015), Book I, ch. 5, p. 20.

²²⁷ Ibid., Book I, ch. 31, p. 74.

²²⁸ Ibid., Book I, ch. 30, p. 70; Book II, ch. 7, pp. 215 – 16.

²²⁹ Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ*, introduced by Max von Habsburg and translated by Robert Jeffery (Penguin Books, 2013), p. xiii.

thereby giving it additional influence.²³⁰ The *Imitatio* may have influenced Cusa's estimation that the Eucharist was greater than relics. In the first chapter of the fourth book, the disciple said to Christ, 'Many people go on pilgrimages to different places to visit the relics of the Saints, amazed at the story of their lives and the splendor of their shrines. They venerate and gaze at their bones, covered with silks and gold. But You are here on the altar, my God the Holy of Holies, Creator of humanity and Lord of the Angels.'²³¹ In the third chapter, the disciple spoke longingly for frequent reception of the sacrament; in the tenth chapter, Christ commanded the disciple, 'Come frequently to the fountain of grace and divine mercy, the fountain of goodness and total purity...the abundant fruit and the great remedies that are provided in Holy Communion.'²³² However, while the councils of Constance and Basel defended the doctrine of transubstantiation, the *Imitatio* was, at best, silent on point, and its last chapter seemed to deny the doctrine—albeit without denying that Christ was somehow present in the Eucharist. Christ opened the chapter by warning his disciple to 'Beware of curious and vain attempts to analyse the Sacrament, which goes much deeper than the human mind can grasp'.²³³ Whatever the orthodoxy of à Kempis' devotion, the popularity of his work ensured that for more than the next two hundred years, the most widely read understanding of the Eucharist would enjoin both frequent reception and a refusal of the scholastic orthodoxy that had long defined official church teaching.

Thomas à Kempis was part of the Brothers of the Common Life, an influential religious movement that grew out of the *Devotio Moderna* ('Modern Devout') of the late-fourteenth

²³⁰ Thomas à Kempis, *Here after foloweth the fourth booke, of the folowyng of Chryste*, trans. Richard Whitford (London, 1531; STC 23962); a version was also translated and 'corrected' by Thomas Rogers, *Soliloquium animae* (London, 1592; STC 23995).

²³¹ à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ*, Book IV, ch. 1, p. 85.

²³² Ibid., Book IV, ch. 10, p. 102.

²³³ Ibid., Book IV, ch. 18, p. 119.

century. Some of their writings were sharply critical of the papacy, as can be seen in the treatise *Ecclesiastical Dignity and Power*. Its author was Wessel Gansfort, whose life largely overlapped with Cusa's. Quite unlike Cusa, Gansfort looked skeptically upon the papacy, and began his work with the bald assertion, 'We are not bound to believe what the pope says unless he believes in a right manner.'²³⁴ More extremely, he asserted that 'Any prelate, even the highest prelate, may err, just as the first of them erred, even though he was personally selected by our Lord Jesus himself, and was filled with the Holy Spirit.'²³⁵ Gansfort offered little context for his comments, but he attacked two recent popes by name: Pius II and Sixtus IV, alleging that they had abandoned the spiritual ideals of the papacy for personal gain. Sixtus IV had a Franciscan background, but had a taste for opulence and power. In 1478, he had conspired to murder Giuliano and Lorenzo de Medici, two of his political rivals, during high mass.²³⁶ The plan was only partially successful; Lorenzo survived. Gansfort therefore counseled his readers to embrace a fairly limited conception of papal loyalty. He wrote that 'people should follow their pastors to the pastures. But if a pastor does not graze his sheep, he is not a pastor; nor is the flock obliged to follow him, since he is then not properly in office.'²³⁷ Near the end of the text, Gansfort all but openly called for rebellion, drawing a line of connection between the failures of spiritual and political leaders. He wrote that the relationship between a bishop and the church was 'not an unbreakable bond', and that kings too 'may justly be deposed from their rule'.²³⁸ Only one thing justified keeping a bad leader in office: a 'reason to fear that repairing the damage done would

²³⁴ Wessel Gansfort, *On Ecclesiastical Dignity and Power*, in Marijn de Kroon, *We Believe in God and in Christ: The Influence of Wessel Gansfort on Martin Bucer*, trans. Maria Sherwood Smith (Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), p. 34

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Eamon Duffy, *Saints & Sinners: A History of the Popes*, second ed. (Yale, 2001), pp. 184 – 9.

²³⁷ Gansfort, *On Ecclesiastical Dignity and Power*, p. 42.

²³⁸ Ibid., pp. 58, 59.

give rise to even worse damage.²³⁹ Like Valla and others, Gansfort did not envision rejecting the papal office, but he did envision rejecting particular popes. The office would remain, even if the officeholder did not.

The chronicles of late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth century England witnessed to all of these developments. In his continuation of the fourteenth-century *Polychronicon*, William Caxton passed over the Council of Basel with barely a mention, but took time to summarize and celebrate the Council of Constance, ‘In whiche was ended the scysme of fourty yere...And many good thynges Institued and ordeyned’:

there was determyned decreed by the hooly synode that the counseyll la[u]fully gadred and assembled representyng the chirche hath vnyuersal power inmedyatly of Cryst To whome euery astate as wel the papal astate as other is bounden and holde to obeye in tho thynges that toucheth the general reformation of the chirche that is to wete in feyth and maners as wel in the heede as in the membrys.

A high estimation of Sigismund appeared here too, and Caxton wrote that ‘by helpe of the noble Emperour Sygysmund’, pope Martin V secured the union of the wider church.²⁴⁰ During the reign of Henry VII (1485 – 1509), the first English translation was made of the *Imitatio*; it was co-translated by Margaret Beaufort, the king’s mother, and William Atkinson, a fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.²⁴¹ The continuity of traditional religious devotion and belief throughout the fifteenth century, described so affectionately by Eamon Duffy in *The Stripping of the Altars*, should not obscure the cataclysmic institutional instability that defined so much of late-fourteenth and fifteenth-century ecclesiastical history. During this time, the English, like the

²³⁹ Ibid., p. 59.

²⁴⁰ William Caxton, *Polychronicon* (Westminster, 1482; STC 13438), sig. CCCCix.

²⁴¹ Thomas à Kempis, *A ful deuout and gostely treatyse of the imitacyon and folowyng the blessed lyfe of our moste mercyful sauour cryste*, trans. by William Atkinson and Margaret Beaufort (London, 1504; STC 23954.7). They attributed the work to Jean Gerson.

French and the Germans, gave their monarchs an increasingly important role to play in the life of their respective churches. A good example of this is the iconography that Henry VII placed on his coinage: a closed or ‘imperial’ crown, which signified that the king was autonomous in his own realm. English kings had been portrayed in this fashion since the late-fourteenth century, but under Henry VII the image and its meaning entered—quite literally—into common circulation.²⁴² Paralleling and perhaps depending upon this development was the claim, made by common lawyers in the late 1480s, that in England, the king’s determinations were superior to those of the pope. Common lawyers also began appealing to fourteenth-century laws against *praemunire* (appeals to the pope).²⁴³ With *Frequens* long abandoned and no council on the horizon, who was there to tell Henry VII to do otherwise?

V.

In 1511, the western church split. No council had met since Basel, and the sixteenth century opened with a renewed concern for councils and reformation. The need was felt strongly enough that upon his election to the See of Rome in 1503, Julius II assured his fellow cardinals that he would call a council by 1505, although he did nothing to fulfill his promise. In 1511, King Louis XII of France and the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian had jointly requested that the pope summon a council. Their request was denied and they subsequently took matters into their own hands.²⁴⁴ Called by the two most powerful political leaders in Christendom, and further supported by a handful of cardinals, the Council of Pisa was a joint declaration against the leadership of Julius II. Because of the political actors involved, Pisa was among the greatest

²⁴² David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 34.

²⁴³ Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 73 – 4.

²⁴⁴ Nelson H. Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)* (Variorum, 1993), Essay II, pp. 62 – 4.

threats to papal authority in more than half a century.²⁴⁵ Schism formally began when the pope excommunicated the cardinals who supported Pisa, replacing them with new cardinals who were loyal to the papacy. When the pope convoked his own council to meet at the Lateran in 1512, the emperor began to vacillate in his support for Pisa, and responsibility for the council was soon placed squarely if unfairly upon the shoulders of Louis. Julius II showed little interest in reconciliation and the schism was not healed until 1513 when his successor Leo X restored the excommunicated cardinals and absolved the French king. Those meeting at Pisa then joined those meeting in the Lateran, where reformation was already a topic of discussion.

Until quite recently, it was long assumed that the Fifth Lateran Council had been poorly attended and was therefore a failure. The extensive work of Nelson H. Minnich has successfully overturned this older historiographical perspective, which Minnich dates to the sixteenth century and the work of Erasmus of Rotterdam. In his satirical attack on the pontificate of Julius II (discussed below), Erasmus framed a libelous discussion between the pope and St. Peter about papal mismanagement of the council. This view was taken up later in the sixteenth century by Roman Catholic authors, including the prolific apologist Roberto Bellarmino, and remained a widely shared view among both Catholics and Protestants into the late twentieth century.²⁴⁶ The poor records kept at the council unwittingly aided this interpretation; among other problems, names were misspelled and some attendees have never been successfully identified.²⁴⁷ Minnich has shown that the council was well attended with at least 350 episcopal sees represented by no less than 431 participants, making it far more representative than any of the sessions at the

²⁴⁵ Ibid., Essay II, pp. 75 – 6.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., Essay I, pp. 157 – 160.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., Essay I, pp. 165 – 74, esp. 168 and 172.

Council of Trent, which collectively exercised far greater long-term influence on Christian history than Lateran V.²⁴⁸

At the opening session on 10 May 1512, a speech read in the name of Julius II touched upon some of the themes long associated with reformation. The council was called ‘for the extinguishing of heresies, the settling of domestic wars between Christians, and the settling of evils and vices that we have long been oppressed by’.²⁴⁹ The council was further directed ‘against the enemies of the faith’ (‘contra fidei hostes’) and it sought the edification of all Christians.²⁵⁰ One week later, the decree passed at the second session stated this in formal terms. Much like the decrees of Ferrara-Florence-Rome, it was set forth in the name of the pope, albeit with reference to conciliar approbation: ‘Julius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the sacred council, for an everlasting record.’²⁵¹ The goals of the council followed: ‘the peace of the whole church, the union of the faithful, the overthrow of heresies and schisms, the reform of morals, and the campaign against the dangerous enemies of the faith’.²⁵² The only reference to reformation here concerned morals. The more sweeping conciliarist concern for reformation ‘in head and members’ was largely absent, although Minnich notes that reformation was discussed in the thirteen speeches delivered to the council, as well as in petitions presented to the bishops. Other thematic connections to traditionally conciliarist concerns may also be found. In the months leading up to the beginning of Lateran V, King Ferdinand II of Aragon called for a return to *Frequens* and for a clarification of the authority of the decrees of Constance

²⁴⁸ Ibid., Essay I, pp. 181 – 97 (for participants) and pp. 197 – 204 (for sees represented); compare these numbers with those on participation at Trent in John W. O’Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Harvard University Press, 2013), pp. 4 – 6.

²⁴⁹ Translated from the Latin found in Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)*, Essay IV, p 238: ‘ut heresibus extinctis, sedatis intestinis Christianorum bellis, et intestinis prope malis et vitiis, quibus obsessi sumus’.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., Essay IV, pp. 238 – 9.

²⁵¹ DEC Vol. I, p. 595.

²⁵² Ibid.

and Basel.²⁵³ Just as Constance and Basel used agrarian imagery, so did Julius II; in his opening speech, the pope compared the church to a field and expressed his desire to return the church to a more pristine state, weeding out that which was destructive.²⁵⁴ Minnich, however, is skeptical of this language. The council's speakers 'could paint the blackest picture of the conditions in Christendom while producing little if any empirical evidence as proof their assertions.' The speeches were a 'parade of stock phrases' and 'obvious exaggerations' that raised the possibility that the bishops suffered from what Minnich terms 'reform hysteria'.²⁵⁵ As a counter-council, perhaps Lateran V had little to offer.

Minnich identifies the *Libellus ad Leonem X*, a Spanish petition, as containing the most comprehensive outline of reformation.²⁵⁶ In a discussion punctuated by medical and corporeal metaphors, the *Libellus* looked to the pope to carry out reform; he was compared to 'a most skilled doctor' ('peritissimo Medico') who could help the church return to 'the piety, purity, and simplicity of the Christian faith as it was in the earliest days of the Faith'.²⁵⁷ The *Libellus* described not just the church but the 'Christian Republic' ('Christiana Republica'), which included the church and its hierarchy, as well as Christian princes and the laws that governed both. Crusade was key.²⁵⁸ The 'plagues' ('pestes') that oppressed the Christian Republic were identified as 'enemies of the Christian religion' ('Christianae Religionis hostes appellare possumus').²⁵⁹ Beginning on 5 May 1514, the ninth session of Lateran V, the reform decrees issued under Leo X used this same language, speaking both of the church and the Christian

²⁵³ Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)*, Essay IV, p. 220.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., Essay IV, p. 164.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., Essay IV, pp. 164.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., Essay IV, p. 222 – 30.

²⁵⁷ *Libellus ad Leonem X*, in D. Johannis-Benedicti Mittarelli and D. Anselmi Constadoni (eds.), *Annales Camaldulenses Ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, Tomus Nonus (Venice, 1773), col. 671: 'ut qualem fuisse in primordiis Fidei, Christianae Religionis pietatem, puritatem, simplicitatemque'.

²⁵⁸ Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)*, Essay IV, e.g., pp. 173, 189 – 90, 200.

²⁵⁹ *Libellus ad Leonem X*, in Mittarelli and Constadoni (eds.), *Annales*, col. 675.

Republic. Leo's concern with reform was similarly prefaced by a call for a crusade, and the *Libellus* was also heavily concerned with Islam. Five of the twelve sessions at Lateran V discussed crusading explicitly, and Leo X's reference to 'the enemies of the Christian faith' in the ninth session indicated the same. As the first council after the fall of Constantinople, the decrees communicated a pervasive concern with the new geopolitical reality.

Lateran V reissued neither *Haec Sancta* nor *Frequens*. The council rejected conciliar primacy by endorsing the view that the pope, as head of the visible church, was the primary agent of reform. However, other, older conceptions of reformation had not disappeared. Instead of successfully monopolizing reformation as papal, the events surrounding the origin of Lateran V merely rendered reformation the site where three fundamentally incompatible definitions converged. Everyone agreed that councils were necessary, but was the source of their authority papal, royal, or conciliar? By 1517, Christendom had three very different concepts of authority attached to the same term: 'reformation'.

The conclusion of the Fifth Lateran Council was met with criticism. The most influential denunciation was *Julius Excluded from Heaven*, which likely appeared in early 1517. Erasmus of Rotterdam is widely believed to have been its author, although he did not claim it as his own. It was a short work that largely consisted of a dialogue between Julius II and St. Peter, although Genius appeared as an occasional interlocutor. The text opened with the recently deceased Julius II arriving at the gates of heaven, only to find that St. Peter would not let him in. As they spoke with one another, the pope vaunted his many sins, which included everything from warmongering to simony and pederasty. In one of his early rounds of boasting, Julius II even declared that the Fifth Lateran Council was among his 'greater achievements'. He bragged, 'I cleverly frustrated a schismatic synod with a bogus counter-council and, as the saying goes, used

one nail to drive out another.’²⁶⁰ In every way, Julius appeared as an opponent of the wider church. Because he convoked the recent council, it was guilty by association.

Despite its title, *Julius Excluded from Heaven* was less about Julius II than about the papacy, church councils, and reform. The character of Julius was a mouthpiece for the most elaborate theology of the papal office. Peter, although not strictly an advocate of conciliarism, criticized papal pretensions while underscoring the necessity of Christian values such as service and humility. At one point, Julius explained, ‘It’s sacrilege even to whisper anything about the Roman pontiff, except in praise of him.’ Peter responded by referencing St. Francis’ metaphor of nakedly following the naked Christ.²⁶¹ With papal bravado on full display, Peter asked Julius about the recent council, which led to a significant debate between the two characters. Having heard Julius declare that ‘The supreme pontiff cannot be censured, even by a general council’,²⁶² Peter countered,

But it is precisely because he is supreme that he must be removed: the greater he is, the more damage he can do. Civil laws can not only depose an emperor for misgovernment, but even sentence him to death; how unhappy is the condition of the church if it is obliged to tolerate a subversive pontiff at Rome and cannot by any means rid itself of such a public nuisance.²⁶³

Julius completely denied the validity of the comparison, and after running down a list of sins for which no pope could be deposed, he claimed that the pope could not even be deposed for heresy. Exasperated, Peter called for civil disobedience: ‘against such a man it is obviously not a general council that is needed, but a rising of the people, armed with stones, to remove him publicly from

²⁶⁰ CWE, vol. 27, p. 172.

²⁶¹ Ibid., p. 177.

²⁶² Ibid., p. 178.

²⁶³ Ibid., p. 179.

their midst as a public nuisance to the whole world.’²⁶⁴ Julius II was a pope so bad that the only solution was the most extreme and violent one possible. Here was a more detailed and explosive version of the solution offered by Wessel Gansfort.

The conversation then turned to why Julius II was so opposed to a general council. Fifteenth-century history loomed large in the background of this discussion, and it occasionally moved to the foreground. Valla’s work on the Donation of Constantine was one evident influence. Through Julius, Erasmus mocked papal excommunication as ‘the dread thunderbolt’,²⁶⁵ and he later had Julius appeal to the Donation of Constantine as justification for making ‘threats to impose absolute silence on the snoopers who try to disprove it.’²⁶⁶ The pope was a cipher for the papacy at its worst. Julius unapologetically stated that papal opposition to councils was due to the love of power, and that he preferred war to church councils. Drawing a parallel between the papal court and the royal courts of Christendom, he was made to say, ‘a gathering of so many distinguished men detracts from the ruler’s authority’.²⁶⁷ Against this, Erasmus placed into Peter’s mouth a communal conception of political wellbeing. The apostle posed the rhetorical question, ‘So you consider that your essential function is to safeguard the regal majesty of the supreme pontiff, rather than the general welfare of the Christian commonwealth?’²⁶⁸ Julius answered in the affirmative.

Only after this did the conversation become more concrete. Julius explained that he denounced Louis XII’s council as ‘a synod of Satan, an assembly of the devil, and a schismatic conspiracy.’²⁶⁹ In order to entice people away from the Pisan council, the pope ‘gave it out that I

²⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 180.

²⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 188.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 192.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 180.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 181.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 182.

was considering reform', which Julius described as the 'most splendid' reason for calling a council.²⁷⁰ On this view, the authority to call councils fell squarely on the pope's own shoulders, and he not only denied that councils might appoint their successors, but that princes or kings might call them as an emergency measure. While declaiming against fifteenth-century precedents, he also referenced an unnamed emperor 'who at one time proclaimed them on his own'.²⁷¹ This was clearly a reference to Sigismund. As head of the church, the pope led the ecclesial body—but as depraved, Erasmus argued, the pope mortally endangered the same. *Julius Excluded from Heaven* concluded with the pope threatening to break through the gates of heaven with an army, while Peter and Genius offered a damning final judgment about the church as a whole. Peter asked, 'Are the rest of the bishops like him?' Genius responded, 'A good many are cast in the same mould, but he's the pacemaker.' Peter then commented, 'I'm really not surprised that so few men reach here, when scoundrels like him have seized the helm of the church. However, I may conclude even from all this, that there's some chance of curing the common people, if they will honour this sink of iniquity simply because he bears the title of pope.' Genius agreed, and the satire ended.²⁷² Erasmus' anti-papal content was, at one and the same time, a declaration of deeply frustrated papal idealism. Because of his office, a good pope could heal the wider church. Julius II was not such a pope, but did this mean that the papacy itself was inherently bankrupt? Erasmus did not say so, and yet his ultimate solution to the problem of Julius II was not a council, but violent overthrow. In the most extreme circumstances, the prince of the humanists conceded that the end might justify the means, but this was no solution for any long-term or systemic problems.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 183.

²⁷¹ Ibid., p. 182.

²⁷² Ibid., p. 197

VI.

Another call for another council was heard in Germany in 1520. It is customary to introduce Martin Luther in 1517, when he posted his Ninety-Five Theses, but he did not become a figure of international importance until after the pope excommunicated him in 1520. Luther responded by burning both the papal bull of excommunication and the canon law. In defense of his actions, he wrote *Why the Books of the Pope and his Disciples were Burned by Doctor Martin Luther*, a collection of canon law excerpts that Luther deemed erroneous. A number of the articles that he rejected pertained to papal sovereignty, particularly over a council. Luther denied, in the words of the fourth article, that ‘The pope and his see are not bound to be subject to Christian councils and decrees.’²⁷³ The doctrine of papal sovereignty was, in Luther’s words, ‘the article’ that he protested against, because from it ‘all misfortune has come into all the world.’²⁷⁴ In denying papal sovereignty, Luther raised the possibility that a council might instead determine disputed matters.

In 1520, Luther published a long open letter entitled *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate*.²⁷⁵ It was a call for reformation—by which Luther meant a church council. He divided *To the Christian Nobility* into two very unequal halves. In the first portion of his letter, he alleged that his opponents, whom he collectively termed ‘The Romanists’, had ‘very cleverly built three wall around themselves.’²⁷⁶ Luther then proceeded to progressively attack the walls, each of which defended papal power in some way. In the second, far longer portion of the text, Luther listed 27 points that he described as ‘matters which ought to be properly dealt with in councils, matters with which popes,

²⁷³ Martin Luther, *Why the Books of the Pope and his Disciples were Burned by Doctor Martin Luther*, in *Luther’s Works*, vol. 31, trans. Harold J. Grimm (Fortress Press, 1957), pp. 379 – 395, here p. 385.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 388.

²⁷⁵ James Atkinson (ed.), *Luther’s Works: The Christian in Society, I*, Vol. 44 (Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 115 – 217.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

cardinals, bishops, and all scholars ought properly to be occupied day and night if they loved Christ and his church.²⁷⁷ The disparity in focus between the first two sections can be quantified; more than seventy-five percent of the work is concerned with Luther's 27 points. In order to focus on councils, Luther had to attack and reject the arguments of Romanists. According to his metaphor of three walls, the first concerned the temporal power, which the Romanists claimed was inferior to the spiritual power of the pope; the second concerned the Scriptures, which the Romanists claimed should be interpreted by the pope; the third concerned councils, which the Romanists claimed could be called only by the pope. Luther appealed to councils throughout his letter and accused the papacy of impeding reformation because it would not call another council. At one point, he even exclaimed, 'Help us, O God, to get a free, general council which will teach the pope that he, too, is a man, and not more than God, as he sets himself up to be!'²⁷⁸ At every point of Luther's argument, the authority of the pope was called into question, and on each of these issues, Luther sided with whatever restrained papal authority. He championed the rights of the German nation, especially the Holy Roman Emperor, as much as he advocated the primacy of Scripture and the independence of councils. None of these arguments was new. By 1520, arguments over sovereignty in the church—whether imperial, papal, or conciliar—were more than a century old.

In England, Luther did not become a subject of focus until 1520, when his books were publicly burnt. Erasmus had mentioned Luther in a few letters from 1518 and 1519, and in February 1520, Thomas More wrote that if the Pope withdrew 'his approbation from the New Testament of Erasmus, Luther's attacks upon the Holy See would be piety itself, compared with

²⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 139.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 169.

such an act'.²⁷⁹ But it was only in 1521 that a campaign against Luther's writings began in England. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, preached against Luther,²⁸⁰ and in 1522 Henry VIII published his *Assertion of the Seven Sacraments*.²⁸¹ Other polemics soon followed. Fisher attacked two of Luther's doctrines: his denial of papal headship and his belief that salvation came by faith alone. Drawing upon the ever-familiar metaphor of the body, Fisher told his listeners that headship was part of the order of nature, both within the church and within the household. 'It were a monstrous syght to se a woman withouten an heed.' Her husband was her head just as Christ was her head, and the same was true of the church, which 'hath an heed of her owne, yt is to say the pope. & yet neuerthelesse chryst Jesu hyr housbande is her heed.'²⁸² Turning to Luther's controversial approach to salvation, Fisher responded with a litany of Biblical texts, ranging from the apostle Paul's hymn to love to the apostle James' assertion that 'A man is iustified by his dedes and not by his faythe alone.'²⁸³ The more important and influential argument came from the king, who attacked Luther's reduction of the seven sacraments to three (Eucharist, baptism, and confession). Sacramental theology became a matter of consistent controversy in mid-sixteenth century England, and allegations of sacramental heresy became one of the most important weapons in theological polemic. Henry VIII defended all seven sacraments, but he began his defense with the Eucharist, which he—like Luther—considered the most important of all. The central error was Luther's rejection of transubstantiation. In a marginal note, the king complained, 'Luther calls the sacrament bread'.²⁸⁴ By denying transubstantiation, the German taught that 'the bread is mixed at the same time with

²⁷⁹ [Thomas] More to [Edward] Lee, in 'Henry VIII: February 1520,' in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII*, Volume 3, 1519-1523, ed. J S Brewer (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1867), 206-217, accessed February 4, 2016, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol3/pp206-217>. No. 640.

²⁸⁰ John Fisher, *The sermon...made agayn ye p[er]nicious doctryn of Martin luther* (London, 1521; STC 10894).

²⁸¹ Henry VIII, *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* (London, 1522; STC 13079).

²⁸² Fisher, *The sermon*, sig. B.iii.v.

²⁸³ Ibid., sig. C.1.

²⁸⁴ Henry VIII, *Assertio*, p. 17: 'Lutherus uocat sacramentum panis.'

the body of Christ'.²⁸⁵ This was the beginning of all Luther's heresies. But the king did not call for a council to resolve the matter. He opened his work by defending the pope against Luther, and for his defense of the sacraments, the pope designated the king 'defender of the faith'. For the time being, the possibility of a council would be a strictly European discussion.

Throughout the 1520s, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, no friend of Luther, also proposed that a council was the best means for settling these acrimonious theological debates. He maintained his position for the next twenty years and repeatedly petitioned the pope to call a council.²⁸⁶ Luther's colleagues and supporters publicly endorsed the same approach in the Augsburg Confession in 1530. Addressed to the emperor and signed by the electors and princes who defended Luther, the Augsburg Confession promised that the signatories would participate in 'a general, free, Christian council'.²⁸⁷ Lutheran confessional documents written over the following years continued to affirm the same. The most important of these was the Augsburg Confession. Written by Luther's humanist colleague Philip Melanchthon, it was presented to emperor Charles V in 1530 at the Diet of Augsburg. Unlike Luther's frequently vitriolic writings, Melanchthon's confession was irenic and emphasized points of shared Christian agreement. In the first paragraph of the Preface, Melanchthon even quoted the imperial summons to the diet, concluding his citation with the emperor's own affirmation that 'Inasmuch as we are all enlisted under one Christ, we are all to live together in one communion and in one church.'²⁸⁸ This was nothing if not a declared commitment to the church as a visible institution. At the end of the Preface, Melanchthon vowed that 'in full obedience to Your Imperial Majesty', the evangelicals would participate in the council already called for by 'the electors, princes, and estates' of the

²⁸⁵ Ibid.: 'panem cum Christi carne simul manere permixtum'.

²⁸⁶ O'Malley, *Trent*, pp. 53 – 5.

²⁸⁷ The Augsburg Confession, Preface, 21, in *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, edited by Robert Kolb and Timothy Wengert (Fortress Press, 2000), p. 34.

²⁸⁸ The Augsburg Confession, Preface, 4 – 5, in *The Book of Concord*, p. 30.

Holy Roman Empire.²⁸⁹ Melancthon followed Luther's lead of 1520 and endorsed the right of political leaders to call what the pope would not. However, this too was an affirmation rather than a rejection of the church. In the tripartite division that had emerged in the fifteenth century over ecclesial authority, Melancthon and Luther affirmed two forms of sovereignty for the German people—a council and temporal authority. They set these against the third candidate for sovereignty—the Roman papacy, with its international reach and influence. None of this indicated any desire to break with the wider church. The wider church was long since broken.

²⁸⁹ The Augsburg Confession, Preface, 21, in *The Book of Concord*, p. 34

Chapter Two

Head or Members?

Bodies in Conflict

‘He [Henry VIII] plainly saw yt no waie there was to a reformation, but by this only meane, if the autoritie and usurped supremitie of the See of Rome wer extirped, abolished, & clene extinct.’

- Nicholas Udall, Preface, *The First Tome or Volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus*, fol. iiii²⁹⁰

I.

In 1534, the western church split—or at least a part of it did. After nearly six years of debate and futile negotiations with the pope about his marriage, Henry VIII severed his ties with the papacy by declaring himself the supreme head (‘supremum caput’) of the English church. It is customary to study Henrician religious history with reference to the sometimes-conflicting religious changes that the king imposed between 1534 and his death in 1547, but reformation was an international discourse about church councils. Rather than assume the existence of a distinct ‘Henrician Reformation’, we should instead study the ways in which Henry VIII discussed the themes long associated with reformation, particularly church councils and the headship of the church. By the time of the king’s death, some English described his rejection of papal authority as the supreme act of reformation. The most important text in this regard was Nicholas Udall’s Preface to his translation of the first volume of Erasmus’ *Paraphrases*. Udall’s argument proved profoundly influential, as will be seen in later chapters. However, the king rarely described his own actions as a reformation; he opposed the pope’s attempt at calling an ecumenical council, and even though Henry transferred images of headship from the pope to himself, he did not redeploy domestically the reform terminology long associated with councils.

²⁹⁰ Erasmus, *The First Tome or Volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the Newe Testament* (London, 1548; STC 2854.3).

There is precious little evidence to suggest that Henry VIII conceived of himself performing the reformation of the English church.

The parliament that began in 1529 and concluded in 1536 is often termed the ‘Reformation Parliament’. Because of its name, it would seem to be the ideal place to begin discussion of the king’s reformation. Problematically, contemporaries did not term it the ‘Reformation Parliament’; major seventeenth-century historians such as Herbert of Cherbury, Peter Heylyn, and Gilbert Burnet wrote of no such event, and searching for the term in the digital database Eighteenth Century Collections Online also yields no hits. The title dates to the nineteenth century and was given widespread usage by Andrew Amos’ 1859 study *Observations on the Statutes of the Reformation Parliament in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth*.²⁹¹ The reception of Amos’ work is not our concern; what matters is that we isolate this anachronistic title and thereby recognize that it cannot help us understand the self-perception of contemporaries.

Beginning in the early 1530s, officially sanctioned religious literature described Henry VIII’s actions in a consistent and repetitious manner. Reflecting the renewed emphasis upon the imperial crown, Henry VIII began describing England as an empire. The frame of reference given for understanding his break with the papacy did not consist of appeals to the particularities of sixteenth-century theological argument, but to the deeper and longer-standing disputes between the papacy and the Christian monarchies of Europe, which had been the most recurrent political fault line in Christendom since the eleventh century. The Henrician regime proactively situated its actions within this historical narrative. The attempted canon law revision of 1535 contained an early articulation of this argument. Never enacted and later lost, the proposed

²⁹¹ Andrew Amos, *Observations on the Statutes of the Reformation Parliament in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth* (Cambridge University Press, 1859).

canons were rediscovered in 1974, but not published in a critical edition until 2000.²⁹² Historians of Tudor England rarely utilize the Henrician canons,²⁹³ but the preface of the text was composed by the king and reveals much about Henry VIII's own mindset. Contrary to popular assumptions, it is inaccurate to describe Tudor religious history as a primarily political and only derivatively theological event.²⁹⁴ Supreme headship of the church was a theological issue of the first importance.

The canons rejected all long-standing papal claims by setting forth a clear doctrine of Christian monarchy. Some of this material was quite traditional, such as when Henry claimed that the 'duty and office' of the king was 'to glorify God, to proclaim the true doctrine of the Christian religion and to preserve the peace and quiet of this empire [imperii].'²⁹⁵ Other elements were more particular to the king's own needs, such as his description of 'Christian kings' as those 'to whom not only secular and civil, but also ecclesiastical power has been given'.²⁹⁶ Henry explained that because of this divine gift, godly monarchs were required to 'remove and destroy those things which seem to go against this aim and to hinder it'.²⁹⁷ Nothing was a greater threat than the papacy, which Henry described as an usurpation that had finally been removed from his realm.

²⁹² F. Donald Logan, 'The Henrician Canons', *The Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 47, no. 1 (1974), pp. 99 – 103; Gerald Bray (ed.), *Tudor Church Reform: The Henrician Canons of 1535 and the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (The Boydell Press & Church of England Record Society, 2000). References to both the Henrician Canons and the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* will be to this edition.

²⁹³ A rare exception may be found in N. L. Jones, 'An Elizabethan Bill for the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Law', *Parliamentary History*, vol. 4 (1985), pp. 171 – 87.

²⁹⁴ See, e.g., Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford University Press, 1993), is predicated on the idea that political reformations preceded 'Protestant Reformation'; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, third ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 258.

²⁹⁵ Bray, *Tudor Church Reform*, p. 5; I have slightly deviated from Bray's translation by translating 'imperii' as 'empire' rather than 'state', as Bray does.

²⁹⁶ Bray, *Tudor Church Reform*, p. 5.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

For this reason it has already been declared to you how, in this our Britain, for many centuries the unjust and intolerable power of the bishop of Rome was hostile to the most holy name of God, how far it was opposed to the preaching of the true doctrine of the Christian religion, how frequently it disturbed the peace and tranquility of this commonwealth, and how, by undermining divinely established royal power, he dared to transfer from the true and just rule of its prince to himself the due obedience of all citizens, contrary to all divine and human right.²⁹⁸

All papal decrees were abolished in England and a revised canon law was intended to take their place. Otherwise, the doctrinal and devotional content were quite traditional; they maintained the whole body of classic creedal doctrine,²⁹⁹ described English Christians as ‘Catholics’,³⁰⁰ and presumed the continuance of traditional liturgical services, feasts, and sacraments.³⁰¹

The 1535 canons addressed several areas singled out for reformation by earlier councils. The third canon addressed simony; bishops who granted orders for money were suspended,³⁰² and they were forbidden from receiving payments for the consecration of churches.³⁰³ The third canon also directed that ‘the benefit of absolution shall be dispensed free of charge’,³⁰⁴ which some Catholics on the European continent also began advocating in 1537. The canons had requirements for clergy, specifying that ‘No one shall be ordained unless he has completed the twenty-fourth age of his age and is judged to be suitable in morals and learning.’³⁰⁵ This was hardly a new theme, but was deeply rooted in the reform literature of the previous century.

However, it is also notable that none of the actions were specified as reforms. The word

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., 1.1, pp. 9, 11.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 1.9, p. 15.

³⁰¹ Ibid., 14.22, p. 61.

³⁰² Ibid., 3.1, p. 17.

³⁰³ Ibid., 3.3, p. 19.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 3.7, p. 21.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 18.2, p. 75.

‘reformation’ was used only in reference to monasticism.³⁰⁶ Given Henry’s later abolition of all monastic houses, the canons’ focus upon the regulation of monasticism may seem surprising, but it likely made good sense at the time. For many centuries, monastic orders had been under the direct oversight of the papacy and largely independent of local episcopal oversight and royal jurisdiction. The king’s concern with their reformation indicated a concern to integrate the monastic houses and orders into the emerging canonical framework of a newly independent English church.

Some of the works printed around 1534 reveal an interest in comparatively recent papal debates. Lorenzo Valla’s attack on the Donation of Constantine was printed in 1534;³⁰⁷ Erasmus of Rotterdam’s *Julius Excluded from Heaven* was printed the same year and then reprinted in 1535.³⁰⁸ Their antipapal arguments were mirrored by the Ten Articles, the regime’s first confessional document, which was published in 1536. In its discussion of the three sacraments of the Eucharist, baptism, and confession, it seems to reveal the influence of German evangelicalism, which recognized only these three as sacraments. Diplomatically, this would have made good sense, as the Ten Articles were written at a time when Henry VIII was in negotiation with the Lutheran princes in the Holy Roman Empire. However, the king was known as a defender of the seven traditional sacraments, and although the canons of the previous year did not address the sacraments directly, passing references to penance and confirmation as sacraments indicates that the canons operated with a broader sacramental framework than German evangelical theology.³⁰⁹ Like the Augsburg Confession, the Ten Articles rejected the

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 11.22, p. 43.

³⁰⁷ Lorenzo Valla, *A treatyse of the donation or gyfte and endowme[n]t of possessyons, gyuen and graunted vnto Syluester pope of Rhome, by Constantyne emperour of Rome* (London, 1534; STC 5641)

³⁰⁸ Erasmus of Rotterdam, *The dialoge betwene Iulius the seconde, Genius, and saynt Peter* (London, 1534; STC 14841.5).

³⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 61, 65.

existence of Purgatory, but in its discussion of the doctrine of Justification, the Ten Articles came to a conclusion wholly opposite the Augsburg Confession by teaching that justification came by ‘faythe joined with charitie’.³¹⁰ Perhaps the Ten Articles were intended to foster concord between the English king and the Lutheran princes; perhaps not.

Like the canons, the Ten Articles opened with a preface that affirmed royal headship in ecclesiastical matters. The first five articles were concerned with the Christian faith. Broadly catechetical, they emphasized the importance of the creeds, explained the sacraments of baptism, penance, and the Eucharist, and finally the doctrine of justification. With the sixth article, the second half of the document turned to ‘the laudable ceremonies used in the churche’.³¹¹ These five articles focused upon things in need of improvement, and the sixth article, which pertained to the devotional use of images, described its modifications of religious practice as ‘refourme’. Images of the saints were first affirmed as ‘representers of vertue and good example’, and because ‘they also be by occasion the kendelers and stirers of mens myndes, and make men ofte to remember and lamente theyr sinnes and offences’. The article then stated, ‘the rude people shulde not from henseforth take such superstition, as in tyme paste it is thought that the same hath used to do, we wyl, that our byshops & prechers, diligently shall teache them, and according to this doctrine refourme their abuses’.³¹² The superstitions in question were specified as sensing, kneeling before, and making offerings to the images. The seventh and eighth articles were directed against devotions attached to saints, while the ninth article urged the maintenance of ‘lawdable customes rytes and ceremonies’.³¹³ Finally, the tenth article denied the existence of Purgatory and claimed that although it is good to pray for the departed, ‘it is moche necessary,

³¹⁰ The Church of England, *Articles Devised by the Kynges Highnes Maiestie* (1536; STC 10033.6), no pag.; if following on from the previous page, this would be sig. C.iii.

³¹¹ Ibid., no pag.; if following on from the previous page, this would be sig. C.iv.

³¹² Ibid., no pag.; if following on from the previous page, this would be sig. C.iv.v.

³¹³ Ibid., sig. D.ii.v.

that suche abuses be clerely put away, which under the name of Purgatory, hath ben aduanced, as to make men beleue that throughe the byshoppe of Romes pardons soules might clerely be delyuered out of Purgatory and all the peynes of it'.³¹⁴ Taken together, the 1535 canons and the Ten Articles offered a fundamental change 'in capite' but little change 'in membris'. This was not a reformation. No one at the time had claimed the contrary.

Henry showed himself quite brutal when dealing with those who resisted his religious changes. As early as 1529, he began appealing to the late-fourteenth century statutes against *praemunire*, which forbade appeals to the pope, and Parliament revived these statutes in 1533. *Praemunire* was deemed treasonous, as was denying the royal supremacy, with the latter carrying the death penalty. The king expected bishops and laity to simply fall in line, and when they did not, he sometimes resorted to this most drastic of measures. To the outrage of Christendom, the king executed John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, in 1535, for treason; Thomas More, who also denied the king's royal supremacy, was executed the same year. Domestic upset also followed. The most controversial new religious development was the king's suppression and consolidation of the nation's monasteries. In 1536, a massive army of laity, numbering perhaps as many as 50,000 people,³¹⁵ protested the king's move. Participants in this event, which is known as the Pilgrim of Grace, carried a banner that contained the five wounds of Christ, which had been originally been intended for use in crusade against Muslims. The symbolism of the five wounds of Christ went on to have a long afterlife in England among those who resisted religious change. The pilgrims also produced a number of articles stating their grievances. One early document, the Lincoln Articles of 9 October, complained that the suppression of the monasteries had brought both spiritual and economic distress to local communities, with some people '[put]

³¹⁴ Ibid., sig. D.iii.

³¹⁵ Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 89.

from theyr levyinges and left at large.’³¹⁶ Another set of articles written in early December 1536 indicated that the Pilgrims identified a wide range of origins for the current state of religion. Beginning with ‘the heresydes of Luther, Wyclif, Husse’, the articles identified a number of other culprits, such as Christopher St. Germain, a supporter of the royal supremacy, and ‘such other heresies of Anibaptist clerely within this realm’. The rebels further demanded ‘to have the supreme head of the church towching cure animarum [the wellbeing of souls] to be reserved unto the see of Rome as before it was accustomyd to be’.³¹⁷ Initially, the king did not grant their request, but he did let the bulk of rebels go, promising to execute only ten of the ringleaders, but after new rebellions arose in 1537, Henry executed at least 144 additional people.³¹⁸ The king also abandoned any attempt at consolidating the monasteries and simply began dissolving them, sometimes selling off their land but sometimes keeping it for himself. When the last monastery was dissolved in 1540, it was clear that the king was no longer committed to the reformation of the monastic houses. By this point, it had also become clear that he was, at best, ambivalent about conciliar reformation.

II.

Reformation became a key theme throughout Christendom once Paul III was elected to the See of Rome in 1534.³¹⁹ In 1536, he called a council to meet in Mantua but was forced to suspend it because the Duke of Mantua refused to have the council there. The following year, Paul III called together a reform commission to study what the council should reform. The membership of the committee is not entirely known, although one member was Reginald Pole,

³¹⁶ Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, sixth ed. (Routledge, 2016), pp. 143.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

³¹⁹ For background, see John W. O’Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), pp. 59 – 73.

who became Archbishop of Canterbury under Mary Tudor. The committee's report, *Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia* ('The Consultation on the Need for Amending the Church'), enumerated a number of abuses in a wide variety of areas.³²⁰ Although the *Consilium* took a negative view of Erasmus,³²¹ the document was sometimes similar to Erasmus' allegations against Julius II. The authors stated their agreement with Paul III's own assessment that 'the origin of these evils was due to fact that some popes, your predecessors, in the words of the Apostle Paul, "having itching ears heaped up to themselves teachers according to their own lusts"'. The authors then directly attacked the view that 'the pope cannot be guilty of simony', and claimed that such a view led to the still worse conviction that 'the will of the pope, of whatever kind it might be, is the rule governing his activities and deeds: whence it may be shown without doubt that whatever is pleasing is also permitted.' In *Julius Excluded from Heaven*, Erasmus had accused Julius II of believing and practicing precisely this, but unlike Erasmus the *Consilium* offered no militant summons and instead decried attitudes such as that attributed to Julius II. 'From this source as from a Trojan source so many abuses and such grave diseases have rushed in upon the Church of God that we now see her afflicted almost to the despair of salvation'.³²² Drawing upon familiar imagery, they described Paul III as a doctor tasked with the duty of restoring the church's health: 'you have seen, and you have rightly seen, that the cure must begin where the disease had its origin'.³²³ The answer was to recognize that sickness of Christendom originated in prior—and arguably recent—papal history. Here, too, the *Consilium* was like *Julius Excluded from Heaven*, which had pleaded for papal intervention despite papal errors.

³²⁰ The text is translated in John C. Olin, *Catholic Reform: From Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent 1495 – 1563* (Fordham University Press, 1990), pp. 65 – 79.

³²¹ Ibid., p. 75.

³²² Ibid., p. 66.

³²³ Ibid., p. 67.

After its opening address to Paul III, the *Consilium* enumerated a number of abuses. One key theme was moral reformation. The first stated abuse pertained to immorality among the clergy, and the authors asserted that ‘From this have come innumerable scandals and a contempt for the ecclesiastical order, and reverence for divine worship not only has been diminished but has almost by now been destroyed.’³²⁴ The authors proposed rectifying this with closer attention to detail at the diocesan level so that only educated and moral men would be brought into the clergy. A similar claim was made about the morals of those in religious orders, who were described as ‘so deformed that they are a great scandal to the laity and do grave harm by their example.’³²⁵ A second key theme was reform at the local level, particularly in the area of pastoral care. The *Consilium* stated that ‘good and learned men’ were needed not just in parish benefices but in bishoprics, and that those who held episcopal office needed to reside in their own dioceses. ‘A benefice in Spain or in Britain then must not be conferred on an Italian, or vice versa.’³²⁶ The authors made clear that the duty of cardinals was international in focus, while ‘the bishop’s duty...is to tend his own flock, which he cannot do well and as he should unless he lives with his sheep as a shepherd with his flock.’³²⁷ The most pervasive theme throughout the *Consilium* was the use and abuse of money in the church. The selling of benefices and the postmortem alteration of wills were both criticized, with the last of these expressly identified as motivated by greed. The *Consilium* also rejected charging fees for the sacrament of absolution, as the Henrician Canons of 1535 had done.³²⁸ The authors concluded by exhorting the pope to imitate his apostolic namesake and restore the church.

³²⁴ Ibid., p. 68.

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 74.

³²⁶ Ibid., p. 69.

³²⁷ Ibid., p. 72.

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 74 (absolution).

News of the impending council elicited responses from a number of figures, including German evangelicals and Henry VIII. At roughly the same time that the pope's reform commission was working on the *Consilium*, Martin Luther began drafting the Smalcald Articles, which were intended to summarize the evangelical program for the impending council.³²⁹ The text and its history reveal that by the late 1530s, significant fractures had developed within the evangelical movement. Luther submitted his text for editing by several of his colleagues, but Melanchthon doubted its worth and the princes deemed it unacceptable. They chose to instead submit to the council the Augsburg Confession and Melanchthon's Apology of the Augsburg Confession as their public professions of faith. Luther and Melanchthon both supported the convoking of a council and desired to attend it,³³⁰ but in the wake of its failure to materialize, Luther revised the Smalcald Articles and in 1538 printed them together with Melanchthon's 'Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope', a short text intended to supplement the Augsburg Confession.³³¹

The Smalcald Articles were generally abrasive. In his opening paragraph, Luther revealed his impatience as he questioned whether Paul III could effectively convene a council.³³² Distinguishing between the good that a council could do for Christendom and the good that it would do for the evangelical movement, the printed version of the text also revealed Luther's remarkable self-confidence.

³²⁹ See the introduction to *On the Councils and the Church*, in *Luther's Works*, vol. 41, trans. Eric W. Gritsch (Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 3 – 178, here p. 6. For a brief over of the publishing history of the Smalcald Articles, see *The Book of Concord*, pp. 295 – 6; a more extensive discussion may be found in Charles P. Arand, Robert Kolb, and James A. Nestingen, *The Lutheran Confessions: History and Theology of The Book of Concord* (Fortress Press, 2012), 139 – 58.

³³⁰ Arand, et. al., *The Lutheran Confessions*, p. 145.

³³¹ Ibid., p. 156. Although outside the purview of the present study, it should be noted that both of these texts were later included in *The Book of Concord* and therefore had a significant impact on the development of Lutheranism.

³³² The Smalcald Articles, Preface, 1, in *The Book of Concord*, p. 297.

I would indeed very much like to see a true council, in order to assist with a variety of matters and to aid many people. Not that we need it, for through God's grace our churches are now enlightened and supplied with the pure Word and right use of the sacraments, an understanding of the various walks of life, and true works. Therefore we do not ask for a council for our sakes. In such matters, we cannot hope for or expect any improvement from the council.³³³

Luther maintained an equally zero-sum approach to papal authority, maintaining later in the text that the papacy had usurped its authority and that this revealed the pope as 'the true end-times Antichrist, who has raised himself over and set himself against Christ'.³³⁴ Melancthon dissented from this claim. He endorsed the theology of the Smalcald Articles, but conceded that 'if he [the pope] would allow the gospel, we, too, may (for the sake of peace and general unity among those Christians who are now under him and might be in the future) grant to him his superiority over the bishops which he has "by human right."'³³⁵ Even if far from a glowing endorsement, such convictions granted the possibility of conciliation.

Luther offered a far more measured consideration of the matter in 1539 with his treatise *On the Councils and the Church*, his most extended consideration of ecclesiastical authority. It began, like the Smalcald Articles, with a discussion of Paul III's failed attempts to convene a council. With words not far removed from the *Consilium*, Luther asserted in the Preface that 'the entire world is to despair of a reformation of the church'. Reformation and a council were synonymous in Luther's mind: 'We see the necessity for a council or a reformation [eins

³³³ The Smalcald Articles, Preface, 10, in *The Book of Concord*, p. 299.

³³⁴ The Smalcald Articles, III, 9 – 10, in *The Book of Concord*, p. 309.

³³⁵ See his subscription to the Smalcald Articles in *The Book of Concord*, p. 326.

Concilium oder Reformation] in the church'.³³⁶ Insofar as a council checked the pope's power, then this limitation was also synonymous with reformation. In a backhanded recognition of the papacy's importance, Luther also wrote that 'if the pope, together with his abiding lords, cardinals, bishops, etc., is unwilling to participation in the reformation or to submit to the councils and the fathers with us, there is no use for a council, nor can we hope for a reformation from him, because he will knock down everything anyway and bid us to keep silent.'³³⁷ Luther's language reveals that instead of desiring to found a new church, he remained deeply attached to the ecclesial structure of Christendom. In the last section of *Councils*, he enumerated seven visible marks of the church: the Word of God, Eucharist, baptism, absolution, an ordained ministry, public worship, and Christian endurance through tribulation.³³⁸ Emphasizing the ordained ministry was not new, but it should serve here as an evident reminder that Protestants did not reject the ordained ministry. For Luther and his supporters, the problem was the pope, not ecclesial structures as such. Luther argued that by not calling a council, the pope and his supporters had put themselves out of the church. 'He [the pope] put himself out of the church to save himself and not perish in and with the church. He is gone and has bidden the church farewell!'³³⁹ The pope was to blame because the pope could bring change. Luther did not identify his own work as reformation. In the last decade of his life, when he finally considered the matter, he determined that reformation was the work of a council and a council alone.

On 8 April 1538, the king of England published his own response to the pope's intended council.³⁴⁰ Like Luther, the authors of the *Consilium*, and others, the king affirmed that a council

³³⁶ LW 41, p. 14; German text in *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, vol. 50 (Weimar, 1914), p. 514, l. 16.

³³⁷ LW 41, p. 16.

³³⁸ Ibid., pp. 148 – 66.

³³⁹ Ibid., p. 13.

³⁴⁰ Henry VIII, *An Epistle* (London, 1537; STC 13081).

was desirable. He even enthused that no one else ‘gladlyer wolde come to it’ because ‘our forefathers inuented nothyng more holyer thanne generall councilles’.³⁴¹ But Henry professed that because of the papal sentence against his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, he did not trust the pope as an arbiter of any kind, and unapologetically stated that ‘The byshop of Rome is our great enemy...His honour, power, and primacie, whiche now are in question, shall they not all be establysshed, yf he being iudge, maye decide oure causes as hym lysteth?’³⁴² There could be no truly free and general council, and even if one were had, the king of England would neither attend nor support it. Some of the king’s apprehension may have been due to the domestic disturbances of the Pilgrim of Grace and its aftermath; he described the present moment as ‘this soo troublesome a tyme’ and protested that ‘we wyll neyther leaue our realme at this tyme, neyther we wyll truste any proctour with our cause’.³⁴³ The letter concluded with a farewell greeting that restated the king’s principal theological contention: ‘Thus myghtye Emperoure fare ye moste hartely well, and ye Christen Prynces, the pyllers and staye of Chrystendome, fare ye hartely well.’³⁴⁴ Insofar as reformation was the work of a council, there would be no Henrician reformation.

If attendance is indicative, many if not most Catholic bishops shared either Luther’s skepticism or Henry’s opposition. When the council finally opened on 13 December 1545, only 29 of Europe’s 700 Catholic bishops were present. During the first ten sessions, the last of which occurred on 2 June 1547, and during the six sessions between 1551 and 1552, not more than 100

³⁴¹ Ibid., *An Epistle*, sig. A.iii; see also sig. A.iiii.v.

³⁴² Ibid., sig. A.iiii.; the reference to Henry’s divorce is on what would be sig. A.vii.v (if following on from sig. A.iiii.).

³⁴³ Ibid., no pag.; if following on from sig. A.iiii., this would be sig. A.vii.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., no pag.; if following on from sig. B., this would be sig. B.i.r – v.

bishops were present.³⁴⁵ This sharply contrasted with Lateran V, which nearly 75% of the bishops attended.³⁴⁶ The new council opened with a summary of its *raison d'être*

for the praise and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, for the increase and advance in esteem of the faith and Christian religion, for the uprooting of heresies, for the peace and unity of the church, for the reform [reformationem] of the clergy and the Christian people, for the crushing and complete removal of the enemies of the Christian name³⁴⁷

The language of 'head and members' was not used, but reforming the entire church was the enunciated goal. Trent showed a pervasive concern with the reformation of particular matters and entitled a number of its decrees 'Decretum de reformatione' ('Decree on reformation'). By describing its work as reformation, Trent remained embedded in the self-conception of earlier councils, but whereas vestiges of conciliar themes were present in the decrees of Lateran V, the same were wholly absent from Trent. The new council neither reissued *Frequens* nor articulated its authority in terms similar to *Haec Sancta*. The decrees of Trent instead began with statements such as, 'The holy ecumenical and general council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, with the same three legates of the apostolic see presiding'.³⁴⁸ The order of emphases is important—divine and then papal authority—but Trent neither defined the parameters of papal authority nor sought any reformation of the papal head. The council wholly side-stepped the burning question of papal authority, arguably the most pressing theological question at the time.³⁴⁹ Trent was, in some very important ways, a different kind of council.

³⁴⁵ O'Malley, *Trent*, p. 4.

³⁴⁶ Nelson H. Minnich, *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)* (Variorum, 1993), Essay I, esp. pp. 175 – 97.

³⁴⁷ DEC, Vol. 2, p. 660.

³⁴⁸ DEC, Vol. 2, p. 663.

³⁴⁹ O'Malley, *Trent*, pp. 251 – 2.

III.

Martin Luther died on 18 February 1546. Henry VIII died on 28 January 1546/7. The bishops at Trent suspended their work on 2 June 1547. They returned to their dioceses and did not reconvene until 1 May 1551. Like his father but unlike Trent, Edward VI did not position reformation as a conceptual bulwark of any kind. Discussion of reformation did occur during his reign, but the terminological framework of Henry's actions animated—and, conversely, constrained—the ways in which Edward's regime articulated its religious goals. In 1681, Gilbert Burnet published a brief, undated document by Edward entitled 'A Discourse about the Reformation of my Abuses'.³⁵⁰ Of its five pages, merely two paragraphs totaling less than one page dealt with religion. The king said nothing about theology, popular devotion, or images, but discussed liturgical reformation in only the broadest and vaguest of terms: 'those Prayers must first, with good consideration, be set forth, and Faults therein be amended'.³⁵¹ No particular thing was specified for reform, only that bishops would amend the liturgy.

This raises the question: did the Edwardian government even have a clear conception of religious change? Diarmaid MacCulloch has described the boy king's reign as an 'evangelical revolution' that sought 'to destroy one Church and build another',³⁵² but we cannot answer this by invoking a modern buzzword like 'revolution'. In deploying such language, we risk restating what George Bernard and Penry Williams denote 'the orthodox Protestant grand narrative of the successful, speedy and inevitable progress of the English Reformation.'³⁵³ In order to understand past events, particularly those as far removed from us as the sixteenth century, we must beware

³⁵⁰ Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1681), A Collection of Records, Part II, Book II, pp. 69 – 73. The work is not paginated consecutively; the Collection of Records follows the Table at the end of Part II, Book III.

³⁵¹ Ibid., p. 69.

³⁵² Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (University of California Press, 1999), pp. 56, 57.

³⁵³ Jennifer Loach, *Edward VI*, edited by George Bernard and Penry Williams (Yale University Press, 1999), p. x.

of imposing descriptive metaphors upon historical actors who could not have used them and would not have recognized the meanings now associated with them. Such is the case with ‘revolution’, whose current definition was borne in the wake of the French Revolution. Conceived now as ‘a radical break with the past’, our own concept of ‘revolution’ was not available to those who lived in the sixteenth century.³⁵⁴ When we look at the sources contemporary with Edward’s regime, we find that instead of deploying a revolutionary lexicon, the regime most frequently retained Henrician language and imagery. If the boy king and his council lacked a distinct vocabulary for expressing their intended religious change, we should question whether or not they even had a clear-sighted conception of change, much less a coherent ‘reform’ program.

Much contemporary scholarship interprets Edwardian religion as having attempted to impose an austere Protestantism upon England, but there were few if any signs of this when the king published his *Iniunctions* in late July 1547. The early Edwardian regime may have been too acutely conscious of Henrician precedent to really contemplate a deep break with the recent past. The funeral of Henry VIII was wholly traditional and the nine-year-old Edward ascended the throne on 20 February with equally traditional rites.³⁵⁵ Jennifer Loach has singled out the notes taken on Archbishop Cranmer’s coronation sermon as the only possible indication that the new regime was intending to alter the kingdom’s allowance of religious images, but given the lack of any other manuscript sources, she recognizes that these notes are little to go on.³⁵⁶ Later developments, such as the revision of the liturgy, were not hinted at in the coronation sermon. Does this therefore indicate a quiet ‘policy of gradualism’ which aimed at attaining a

³⁵⁴ See Keith Michael Baker, *Inventing the French Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 203.

³⁵⁵ Jennifer Loach, ‘The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII’, *Past & Present*, no. 142 (Feb., 1994), pp. 43 – 68; idem., *Edward VI*, 29 – 38.

³⁵⁶ Loach, *Edward VI*, pp. 37, 48 – 9.

preconceived and total transformation?³⁵⁷ It is easy to assume that the regime was committed to measured yet perpetual change, but problematically, government documents spell this out as little as they spell out the revolutionary converse. The *Iniunccions* were comparatively silent on matters of religious alteration. If the backdrop of Henrician religion is used as their immediate context, one could argue that the new injunctions were actually more conservative than those of Elizabeth in 1558, which explicitly rejected some of the traditional religious practices revived by Mary after 1553.³⁵⁸ Edward's *Inivnccions* opened by praising King Henry VIII and immediately denounced the 'pretensed and usurped power and iurisdiccion' of the papacy.³⁵⁹ As if basking in the penumbra of Henrician religious polemic, opposition to both idolatry and the papacy were the most regular themes in the *Inivnccions*. Rejection of one was always linked to rejection of the other. The papacy was expressly tied to idolatry in the first injunction, and the second and third injunctions spelled out the need for casting idolatry out of England. The eleventh and twelfth injunctions were the same; the former deprecated idolatry while the latter attacked papal supremacy. The anti-papal polemic within the Injunctions was Henrician in origin, and its retention indicates that the document's opening praise of the recently-deceased king was not merely superficial.

Edward's regime authorized several religious texts for use throughout the kingdom. Four of these were named in the *Iniunccions*. The 1545 *Primer* of Henry VIII and the English translation of the Bible were simply retained from the previous reign, but the Book of Homilies and the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus were new to Edward. The Book of Homilies was intended as an aid for those who did not compose quarterly sermons, clergy were commanded to purchase and study the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus for themselves while also making a copy of the text available

³⁵⁷ MacCulloch, *The Boy King*, p. 74.

³⁵⁸ See also Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, second ed. (Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 568ff.

³⁵⁹ Edward VI, *Inivnccions geven by the moste excellente Prince, Edwarde the sixte* (London, 1547; STC 10089).

in their parishes.³⁶⁰ Erasmus was already well known and also widely respected, and his centrality to the Edwardian *Iniunccions* is another important thread of continuity between the reign of Henry VIII and that of his son. Translation of the *Paraphrases* began under the patronage of Queen Catherine Parr in the latter years of Henry's rule, but was not completed until after the king's death.³⁶¹ The first volume of *Paraphrases*, which contained the four gospels and Acts, was published in 1548. The second volume was published in 1549; it contained the rest of the New Testament aside from the Apocalypse, which Erasmus did not write a paraphrase upon.

Of the four religious texts approved by the Edwardian *Inivnccions*, only the first volume of the *Paraphrases* discussed reformation. Composed by Nicholas Udall, the volume's dedication to Edward VI was at once both an encomium for the late king and an exhortation that Edward VI follow in the footsteps of his father. Henry was commemorated with reference to Plato's ideal of the philosopher king,³⁶² and commended as 'a most vigilaunt pastour' and 'a moste christian Prince'³⁶³ who recognized that there was 'no waie there was to a reformation, but by this only meane, if the autoritie and usurped supremitie of the See of Rome wer extirped, abolished, & clene extinct.'³⁶⁴ By casting out 'usurped' authority, Henry VIII's rule was allowed to flourish—and with it, true religion as well. Udall detailed an Erasmian vision of abuse within the church. He described 'the moste corrupt doctrine of the Romishe papacie' as including 'vain ceremonies' and 'supersticious weorkes', such as 'pilgremages' and 'transferryng the honour

³⁶⁰ Ibid., nn. 07, 20.

³⁶¹ Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (University of Toronto Press, 2009), p. 7; Stephen Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 116, 122 – 3.

³⁶² Erasmus, *The first tome*, sig. ii.

³⁶³ Ibid., sig. ii.v, sig. iii.

³⁶⁴ Ibid., sig. iii.v.

whiche was due to God alone, unto Sainctes and to feigned miracles'.³⁶⁵ These matters were satirized by Erasmus decades earlier in works such as the *Colloquies* and *The Praise of Folly*, and as an attack on popular religion, such polemics also aligned with the content of the Edwardian Injunctions. Alongside these critiques, Udall used florid praise of Henry VIII to emphasize that Edward VI should maintain the changes already wrought by his father. According to Udall, reformation had been fully accomplished under Henry VIII.

Udall's image of reformation circulated widely. Gregory D. Dodds estimates that at least 20,000 and perhaps as many as 30,000 copies of the first volume were printed.³⁶⁶ With Edward having commanded every parish church to purchase a copy of the *Paraphrases*, and with Elizabeth later reiterating this at the beginning of her reign, Udall's portrayal of Henry's reformation was disseminated to every corner of England. In 1548, royal reformation became the most widely disseminated understanding of reformation in England.

IV.

One of the most important and influential discussions of reformation in Edwardian England pertained to the liturgy. In the royal decree that prefaced Archbishop Cranmer's 1548 *Order of Communion*, the first English-language liturgy for the Eucharist, the king hoped that the new liturgy would encourage his subjects 'to trauell for the reformation, and setting furthe of suche godlye ordres'.³⁶⁷ Cranmer was influenced by the principle work of Hermann von Wied, the Lutheran-sympathizing Archbishop of Cologne, who held his see from 1515 until 1546, when he was removed from his office by Pope Paul III. Bucer became Archbishop Wied's court preacher in 1542, but after Wied's forced resignation and the beginning of the Augsburg Interim

³⁶⁵ Ibid., sig. iii.

³⁶⁶ Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus*, pp. 10 – 11.

³⁶⁷ The Church of England, *The Order of Communion* (London, 1548; STC 16457), sig. Aij.v.

in 1548, Bucer fled and eventually settled in England.³⁶⁸ In 1543, Wied published *Einfaltigs Bedencken* (*A Simple Consideration*), a comprehensive volume that on its title page announced ‘a Christian Reformation according to the word of God’ (‘ein Christliche in dem wort Gottes gegrünte Reformation’).³⁶⁹ Written with several other theologians, most notably Martin Bucer and Philip Melanchthon,³⁷⁰ Wied ranged across a number of topics, such as the doctrine of God, the sacraments, and liturgical ceremonies; he also discussed issues as diverse as the reformation of monasteries and convents, which he saw no need to abolish, and the need for both men and women to receive university education. He embraced Lutheran emphases such as the distinction between law and gospel, the doctrine of justification by grace through faith alone, and an affirmation of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but he combined these with a more traditional understanding of the sacramental system. The German Archbishop began his discussion of the sacraments with baptism, continued on with confirmation and the Eucharist, and then enumerated the remaining four sacraments. He encouraged the maintenance of private confession and taught that God had instituted the ordained ministry.³⁷¹ Wied proposed a number of revised liturgical rites and prayers along with a considerable amount of catechetical material. Pervasively theological, *Einfaltigs Bedencken* advocated ‘reformation of the church through the whole German nation’ (‘Reformation der kirchen durch ganze Teutsche Nation’).³⁷² Unlike the royal reformation celebrated by Udall, Wied’s reformation was archiepiscopally led and secured.

A Latin translation of *Einfaltigs Bedencken* was completed in 1545 and printed as *Simplex ac Pia Deliberatio*. Cranmer owned a copy of this version, and it greatly influenced

³⁶⁸ Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and his Times*, trans. Stephen E. Buckwalter (Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), pp. 183 – 95.

³⁶⁹ Hermann von Wied, *Einfaltigs Bedencken* (Cologne, 1543).

³⁷⁰ Greschat, *Martin Bucer*, p. 189, argues that ‘Melanchthon and Bucer are thus to be considered the rightful authors.’

³⁷¹ Hermann von Wied, *A Simple, and Religious Consultation* (London, 1547; STC 13213), pp. 229v – 234r, 237r – 240r.

³⁷² Wied, *Einfaltigs Bedencken*, p. ii.

him.³⁷³ Bryan Spinks has gone so far as to describe Wied as ‘Cranmer’s favourite contemporary source’.³⁷⁴ Working from the Latin edition, an English translation was printed in 1547 as *A Simple, and Religious Consultation*. A second edition appeared in 1548. Wied’s work heavily influenced Cranmer’s *Order of Communion* and translated excerpts from the *Deliberatio* were also published under the title *The Right Institucion of Baptisme*.³⁷⁵ Both of these were printed in 1548. The 1549 edition of *The Right Instytucion of Baptisme* contained a further excerpt from Wied on burial,³⁷⁶ and two editions of his pastoral guidance on marriage were published in 1553 as *A Brefe and a Playne Declaration of the Dewty of Married Folkes*.³⁷⁷ Through translation, the English church was put in touch with, if not brought wholly into the orbit of, Wied’s archiepiscopal reformation.

If Edward’s councilors sought a fundamental break with the past, then one would expect to find their revolutionary lexicon present in the extensive liturgical changes imposed in 1549 through the first Book of Common Prayer, which contained English liturgies for all major services of the church *sans* those pertaining to ordination. However, the royal injunctions and other texts written through 1550 yield no such evidence of this. In the *Inivncions*, the mass was referred to as such,³⁷⁸ the Eucharist was denoted as ‘the blessed Sacrament of the aulter’,³⁷⁹ the ‘office and funccon’ of the priesthood was described as ‘appoynted of God’,³⁸⁰ and clergy and

³⁷³ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer* (Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 393, 414; see the more extensive discussions in Gordon P. Jeanes, *Signs of God’s Promise: Thomas Cranmer’s Sacramental Theology and the Book of Common Prayer* (T & T Clark, 2008), pp. 100 – 110, 248 – 51, 260 – 1.

³⁷⁴ Bryan D. Spinks, ‘Treasures Old and New: A Look at Some of Thomas Cranmer’s Methods of Liturgical Compilation’, in Paul Ayriss and David Selwyn (eds.), *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar* (The Boydell Press, 1993), pp. 175 – 188, here p. 187.

³⁷⁵ Hermann von Wied, *The Right Institucion of Baptisme* (London, 1548; STC 13211).

³⁷⁶ Hermann von Wied, *The Right Instytucion of Baptisme* (London, 1549; STC 13212).

³⁷⁷ Hermann von Wied, *A Brefe and a Playne Declaration of the Dewty of Married Folkes* (London, 1553; STC 13208).

³⁷⁸ Edward VI, *Inivncions*, n. 21.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, n. 09.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, n. 33.

laity were directed to maintain the annual Lenten confession of sin.³⁸¹ The eating of meat during Lent would remain forbidden throughout the reign. Was all of this merely a concession to popular practice, or was this language the actual mental architecture of the Edward's government? A survey of Cranmer's surviving writings between 1547 and 1550 indicate that this same traditional language was also very much his own. In 'Questions Put Concerning Some Abuses of the Mass', a manuscript from late 1547 or early 1548, Cranmer referred to the Eucharist as 'the sacrament of the altar' and expressly described the mass as having been instituted by Christ.³⁸² Cranmer's visitation articles of 1548 inquired whether Lenten confession continued,³⁸³ and the Ordinal of 1550, which contained the vernacular liturgies for ordination, maintained that holy orders were of apostolic origin. In all of these matters, Cranmer was in full agreement with Wied. There is too much consistency across these texts to assume that Edward's government, let alone the Archbishop of Canterbury, was planning something aptly described as 'revolutionary'.

The first reference to liturgical alteration under the new regime was made in Edward's twenty-seventh injunction. Clergy were told to 'instructe and teache in their cures, that no man ought obstinately, and maliciously, breake and violate, the laudable Ceremonies of the Church, by the kyng commaunded, to be observed, and as yet not abrogated.'³⁸⁴ Cranmer had been drafting and revising liturgical texts since the 1530s, and this last clause—'as yet not abrogated'—likely foreshadowed at least some of the liturgical developments that were

³⁸¹ Ibid., n. 09.

³⁸² In Thomas Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, vol. 2, edited by John Edmund Cox (The Parker Society/Cambridge University Press, 1846; reprinted Regent College Publishing, n.d.), pp. 150 – 1. The same view is found in the undated manuscript 'Some Questions, with Answers Made to Them by the Bishops of Worcester, Chicester, and Hereford', in *idem.*, pp. 152 – 3.

³⁸³ Ibid., p. 155.

³⁸⁴ *Inivncions*, n. 27.

promulgated several years later.³⁸⁵ Two other texts lend weight to this interpretation. First, a royal proclamation dated 6 February 1548 stated that Archbishop Cranmer ‘hereafter shall declare’ which liturgies would be ‘omitted or changed’.³⁸⁶ The Archbishop did this through the Book of Common Prayer, which was published in 1549. Second, when the English communion service was published in 1548, it was prefaced by a royal proclamation which exhorted subjects ‘to receive this our ordinance, and most Godly direction, that we may be encouraged from time to time, further to travail for the reformation and setting forth of such Godly orders, as may be most to God’s glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion.’³⁸⁷ Here was the liturgical reformation that Edward so briefly touched upon in ‘A Discourse about the Reformation of my Abuses’.

Terminological continuity linked the twenty-seventh injunction with the liturgies published between 1548 and 1550. First, and like the *Iniunctions*, the traditional terminology of ‘mass’ and ‘altar’ was retained in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. Second, in a short essay entitled ‘Of Ceremonies’, which concluded the first Prayer Book, Cranmer wrote against both ‘the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned’ and ‘innovations and newfangledness, which...is always to be eschewed.’³⁸⁸ Like the *Iniunctions*, ‘Of Ceremonies’ envisioned orderly change by lawful authority. The Archbishop’s essay was not a battle cry of any sort, but instead concludes with a series of liturgical rubrics, one of which allowed select devotional practices traditionally associated with the mass, such as striking the breast during confession, to be ‘used or left, as every man’s devotion serveth, without blame.’³⁸⁹ Such sentiments were hardly

³⁸⁵ MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 221ff.

³⁸⁶ In Cox (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, vol. 2, p. 509.

³⁸⁷ Joseph Ketley (ed.), *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552* (The Parker Society/Cambridge University Press, 1844; reprinted Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006), p. 2.

³⁸⁸ Ketley, *The Two Liturgies*, pp. 156 – 7.

³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

revolutionary, and it is worth noting that striking the breast continued to be practiced; nonconforming clergy complained about striking the breast through at least the early-seventeenth century.³⁹⁰ Third, the continued high understanding of holy orders is worth noting. Cranmer, like Luther, had no conception of a ‘priesthood of all believers’. The preface of the 1550 Ordinal began, ‘It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ time there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ’s church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons’.³⁹¹ This view was not unique to Cranmer; Wied held the same, and so did Martin Bucer.³⁹² Holy orders were intended to remain something more than merely secular offices in Edwardian England, despite some recent claims to the contrary.³⁹³ In the first half of Edward’s reign, religious language indicated no desire for a profound break with the English religious past.

This is not to deny that the Book of Common Prayer changed a number of things. Having a central set of liturgies was a considerable change as it imposed total liturgical uniformity across England, thereby abolishing the regional and personal liturgical variety that had defined English worship for centuries. Until 1549, the liturgy was performed by the priests; the people followed along, praying their own individual prayers at the same time. The reading of the Gospel, which was always done in the vernacular, and the elevation of the consecrated Host, were among the few moments when clergy and the people participated in the same ritual act. This made the Eucharistic elevation a key moment in the service. The Eucharistic theology and piety of the new liturgies was far removed from that of popular devotion. Rather, the sacraments were to be received. The new liturgies proffered a very different understanding of the Eucharist; they

³⁹⁰ William Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference* (London, 1604; STC 1456.5), p. 67

³⁹¹ Ketley, *Two Liturgies*, p. 161.

³⁹² For Bucer, see E. C. Whitaker, *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer* (The Alcuin Club, 1974), pp. 176 – 83.

³⁹³ Loach, *Edward VI*, p. 126; MacCulloch, *The Boy King*, p. 183.

enjoined utraquism and forbade the priest to elevate the bread and wine once they were consecrated. The Prayer Book instead directed the priest to then invite the people to come and receive the sacrament in both kinds. This too was wholly out of step with traditional liturgical practice, which had the clergy receive the Eucharist while the people either looked on or went back to their own prayers. The one exception was Easter, when everyone communicated.

Cranmer's general hostility to Eucharistic spectacle shaped other facets of the Book of Common Prayer as well. One of the most popular feasts in the church year, Corpus Christi, was removed from the new church calendar. Traditional popular devotion had involved processing with the Eucharist on Corpus Christi, thus making it something seen, and devotions were made to the Eucharist displayed in the pyx. In striking Corpus Christi from the calendar and forbidding the elevation of the consecrated elements, Cranmer and his colleagues hit out against popular devotion. Other changes to the calendar were no less extensive. Given the much larger festal culture surrounding the saints, with the exception of All Saints (1 November), the only saints' days in the Prayer Book were those for the New Testament apostles. Although church seasons and major holy days such as Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost were retained, the regime's liturgical centralization was at the same time an act of liturgical constriction. Much of the festal culture of centuries and generations was done away with, as was the liturgical and linguistic particularity of given locales.

The Book of Common Prayer was not well received. The most violent rejection of it came from Devon, where its opponents published sixteen articles that detailed their objections. The rebels did not demand the restoration of Catholicism but the reinstitution of religious practices that had existed under Henry VIII. Writing in the name of king, the Duke of Somerset published the regime's official response. He did not believe the rebels' repeated references to

Henry VIII's religious settlement, but instead alleged, 'If euer Papistes poysoned good subiectes, it is nowe.'³⁹⁴ The king's council widely believed that this and other uprisings—including Kett's rebellion, which was not about religion—were the work of Catholic conspirators.³⁹⁵ Many of the rebels' arguments were about changes to the mass. Joined by protesters from Cornwall, the rebels in Devon refused both the sacramental practice of the new Prayer Book and the use of the vernacular, comparing the new service to 'a Christmas game.'³⁹⁶ The king's council wholly disagreed, and told the rebels that the Book of Common Prayer contained 'The self same woordes in Englishe, which were in Latin, savyng a fewe thynges taken out, so fonde that it had been ashame to haue heard them in Englishe'.³⁹⁷ The Book of Common Prayer was but the mass translated and restored to its pristine purity. 'For the masse,' the king concluded, 'it is brought euen to the very vse as Christ left it, as thapostles vsed it, as holy fathers deliuered it, in dede some what altered, from that the Popes of Rome for their lucre brought to it.'³⁹⁸ Anti-papal but conventional, this proved an immensely influential response. Later authors cited these exact words in their description of mid-Tudor religious change,³⁹⁹ and later opponents of the Book of Common Prayer argued similarly that the English service book was far too similar to the mass. Whether intentionally or not, the regime's letter bequeathed to later generations a comparatively conservative vision of Edwardian religion. Read against the din of rebellion and sedition, conformity appeared the handmaiden of peace and tradition.

³⁹⁴ Edward VI, *A Message Sent by the Kynges Maiestie, to Certain of His People, Assembled in Deuonshire* (London, 1549; STC 7506).

³⁹⁵ Barrett L. Beer, *Rebellion & Riot: Popular Disorder in England during the Reign of Edward VI*, rev. ed. (The Kent State University Press, 2005), pp. 114–15, 149–50.

³⁹⁶ Fletcher and MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, p. 154 n. 8.

³⁹⁷ Edward VI, *A Message*, no pag. This would be sig. B if counting back from Sig. B1v.

³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. B1v.

³⁹⁹ See, e.g., John Hayward, *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth*, edited by Barrett L. Beer (The Kent State University Press, 1993), p. 79.

Archbishop Cranmer also wrote a point-by-point response, and he too contended that the rebels were either papists or crypto-papists, and thus ‘traitors by the laws of this realm’.⁴⁰⁰ At his more effusive, and much like Nicholas Udall, the Archbishop praised Henry VIII in Platonic terms; drawing upon the *Republic*’s allegory of the cave, the late king was described as leading England out of ‘a dark dungeon’ and into ‘the true light and knowledge of God’s word.’⁴⁰¹ In explaining the new English liturgies, traditional religious terminology was again used to defend the use of English rather than Latin in the mass. In responding to the rebels’ complaints against the Prayer Book, Cranmer posed the rhetorical question, ‘So have the Greeks the mass in the Greek tongue, the Syrians in the Syry tongue, the Armenians in their tongue, and the Indians in their own tongue. And be you so much addict to the Romish tongue, (which is the Latin tongue,) that you will have your mass in none other language but the Romish language?’⁴⁰² This was not an argument about the mass itself, but about the politics of its vernacular performance. In order to logically cohere, however, this argument depended upon the continued existence of the mass in England. The same set of assumptions about the vernacular as a medium for translation rather than change were at work in the Archbishop’s defense of the English translation of the Bible: ‘until this day the Greeks have it in the Greek tongue, the Latins in the Latin tongue, and all other nations in their own tongue.’ As with the apologetic for the English mass, rhetorical questions were used to further vindicate the stance on the English Bible: ‘will you have God farther from us than from all other countries; that he shall speak to every man in his own language that he understandeth and was born in, and to us shall speak a strange language that we understand not? And will you that all other realms shall laud God in their own speech, and we

⁴⁰⁰ Cox (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, vol. 2, p. 165.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., p. 173.

⁴⁰² Ibid., p. 170.

shall say to him we known not what?’⁴⁰³ Here too was an argument not about the Bible itself, but about its vernacular accessibility. The parallel content in these two arguments mitigates against the view that the regime used the term ‘mass’ as a mere stopgap in 1549. Translation *was* continuity.

Uprisings such as that in Devonshire left the king’s council deeply unsettled and a government-sponsored sermon against rebellion was quickly produced.⁴⁰⁴ Its authorship is unknown, but Cranmer produced a short set of notes for the sermon that survive. In it, ten Biblical passages, some from the Old Testament and others from the New, were followed by a much shorter set of historical referents to Jack Cade, Jack Straw, and the revolts that convulsed Germany in the 1520s. After these were six points which collectively argued that ‘subjects must obey in all worldly things’, and that they had no right to make violent demands.⁴⁰⁵ The notes continued with a further set of five historical examples. Four were from Biblical history, but the fifth again mentioned Germany: ‘Also, in Germany lately, and now among us. For the devil can abide no right reformation in religion.’⁴⁰⁶ Regrettably, the sermon neither explained nor expanded upon Cranmer’s ideas about a ‘right reformation in religion’, but the notes did claim that ‘subtle papists’ had ‘persuaded the simple and ignorant Devonshire men, under pretence and colour of religion, to withstand all godly reformation.’⁴⁰⁷ It is difficult to say whether this ‘godly reformation’ was a direct reference to the liturgies contained in the Book of Common Prayer, but Cranmer’s notes show that, in his mind, religious reformation was not necessarily distinct from political reformation. As with his response to the Devonshire articles, rhetorical questions were quickly deployed as forceful arguments in the sermon notes: ‘Is it the office of subjects, to take

⁴⁰³ Ibid., p. 183.

⁴⁰⁴ For details, see MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 435 – 7.

⁴⁰⁵ Cox (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, vol. 2, p. 188.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 189.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 193.

upon them the reformation of the commonwealth, without the commandment of common authority? To whom hath God given the order and reformation of realms? To kings or to subjects?’⁴⁰⁸ In the Archbishop’s sermon notes, both religious and political reformation were the work of princes, whom subjects were expected to obey.

V.

Other currents, perhaps religious but perhaps not, were also at work. For whatever reasons, sporadic acts of iconoclasm took place in a number of parishes shortly after Edward took the throne. At the beginning of his reign, there were at least some instances when the council condemned iconoclasm and ordered that destroyed images be replaced.⁴⁰⁹ Furthermore, some acts of effacement, such as covering pictures of the pope or Thomas Becket, merely maintained the determinations of Henry VIII—a clear sign that in 1547, the new regime had not adopted a clear and distinct religious program. But the theft of church goods increased, and images were soon officially removed, by government order. Many, including some of those at the heart of the establishment, were upset by the desecration and spoliation of churches. Support for iconoclasm did not translate into accepting or approving the theft of silver, gold, and other valuables from England’s parishes. Martin Bucer concluded his response to the Book of Common of Prayer with a lengthy remonstrance against the ‘plundering of churches.’⁴¹⁰ Reflecting upon the pervasive unrest then present in England as well as the experiences which predicated his own flight from the Holy Roman Empire, Bucer feared that divine judgment would be inflicted upon those who refused to recognize ‘how grave a sacrilege it is to gain or to repay the good graces of men by taking anything away from the Church of Christ for other

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁹ Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 453 – 4.

⁴¹⁰ Whitaker, *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 160.

purposes than those of the churches.⁴¹¹ Given the conservative religious vocabulary in play at the time, none of this should be surprising.

The political turmoil in Devonshire and elsewhere was soon matched by political turmoil within the king's council. In early October 1550, opponents of the Duke of Somerset demanded his resignation, and on the 14th of that month he was commissioned to the Tower of London, where he remained until the middle of the following January. During this time, extensive iconoclasm and spoliation took place throughout English churches; beginning in November 1550, many parishes throughout England saw their altars destroyed and replaced with movable communion tables. Eamon Duffy and Diarmaid MacCulloch have both argued that these changes were ideological and that they revealed the true nature and intent of Archbishop Cranmer and the Edwardian regime. In a brilliantly embittered turn of phrase, Duffy has written that 'Iconoclasm was the central sacrament of the reform'.⁴¹² However, from the time of Edward's death onward, the ransacking of churches was attributed to the single motive of a single man: the ever-greedy John Dudley, duke of Northumberland, who maneuvered his way into the position of president of the privy council. As we will soon see, when Dudley was executed in 1553, he confessed as much. None of this is to deny the profound effects—devotionally, liturgically, and theologically—of iconoclasm upon the shape of English religion, but the motivation ascribed to and confessed by Northumberland must also be kept in mind. Under Somerset, traditional liturgical terminology was used consistently; only with his removal and a change of the political guard did this language and its attendant architecture change. Perhaps later English authors were inclined to gloss over the rampant destruction overseen by Northumberland; or, perhaps these same authors understood something that recent historians have been too quick to ignore.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., p. 162.

⁴¹² Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p. 480.

During Northumberland's presidency, Archbishop Cranmer and his supporters undertook several new religious projects. The first of these was a revision of the Book of Common Prayer, which was published in 1552. In the period covered by this study, most later English accounts of Tudor history saw little difference between the two liturgies, although more recent scholarship has tended to emphasize their disparity. Reflecting the absence of altars from many parishes, the new liturgies did not reference an altar but a table instead; the word 'mass' was also absent from the revised liturgy, and the consecrated Eucharist was not described as the body and blood of Christ. Traditional vestments were not to be used, and the first Prayer Book's allowance for striking the breast was nowhere mentioned in the new liturgical rubrics, either. Furthermore, only two saints were added to the new calendar: St. George (April 23) and St. Laurence (August 10). If we read these changes within a teleological framework in which earlier changes are seen as 'more Catholic' and latter changes as 'more Protestant', and if we associate being 'more Protestant' with being 'less sacramental', then the 1552 liturgies could be seen as expressly indicating a new confessional and devotional direction for the English nation.

We are given a rather different perspective if we look at two works from 1553. The first of these is the Edwardian *Primer*. In a remarkable departure from the calendars of 1549 and 1552, the *Primer* added over 130 saints to the calendar, ranging from Church Fathers such as Hilary (13 January) and Augustine (28 August), to martyrs such as Felicity (14 January) and Perpetua (7 March), and to monastic leaders such as Benedict (24 March) and Francis of Assisi (4 October). A number of saints with particular importance to England's religious history were also included, such as Augustine of Canterbury (26 May), Cuthbert (31 August), and Winifred (3 November). Edward the Confessor was given all three of his traditional feast days (18 March, 20 June, and 13 October), the last of which is notable because it was traditionally the feast of the

translation of his relics. Thomas Becket appeared in the new calendar on 8 July, but was designated 'Becket Traitor.' The 1553 calendar did not indicate a sudden renewal of the traditional cult of the saints, but it centralized, codified, and commemorated a large number of key figures. In many ways, the new calendar set the standard for later Anglican approaches to the saints. The more colorful and sometimes raucous celebrations of prior centuries, together with the passionately held belief that particular saints interceded for particular things, were gone. The saints of the 1553 calendar were the saints of the theologian's study, remembered and revered but dispassionately so.

The second key work from 1553 was the canon law revision. It too was quite far from approximating a revolutionary or iconoclastic reordering of the Church of England. The Archbishop and his colleagues relied quite heavily upon earlier collections of canon law, and it has been estimated that for some portions of the canon law, as much as 95% of the text depended upon the canonical precedent of earlier centuries.⁴¹³ A good example of this conservatism can be seen in its approach to the sacraments.⁴¹⁴ Five sacraments were clearly identified while two were left ambiguous. Baptism, Eucharist, ordination, marriage, and confirmation all received individual treatment. This left confession and the anointing of the sick undefined, but after the discussion of confirmation, in a new section entitled 'Pastors must visit the afflicted', it was written, 'Pastors of churches shall diligently visit the weak, afflicted and sick, and sustain them as far as they can by their prayers and consolations, in their most difficult and dangerous moments.'⁴¹⁵ It is unclear whether the authors intended to collapse confession and unction together into a single sacramental category, or if they envisioned the pastoral act encompassing two sacraments. They may have been separate. The thirty-third section of the canon law

⁴¹³ Bray, *Tudor Church Reform*, pp. lxiv – lxv.

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 226 – 31.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

contained a form for receiving the excommunicated back into the church that utilized traditional confessional language. After the excommunicated confessed their sins, the priest laid his hand upon the penitent's head and said 'I [Ego], before this church, whose administration has been committed to me, absolve you [te exsolvo] from the penalty of your sins and the bonds of excommunication'.⁴¹⁶ The Edwardian canon law certainly envisioned six sacraments, and it retained the form—and possibly the affirmation—of the seventh.

This approach was not strange for the 1550s and should not be taken as reflecting any kind of English or Anglican exceptionalism. Looking at the broader European context, a number of different sacramental theologies were advanced from the 1540s onward, and the Edwardian canon law should be read in this light. Archbishop Hermann von Wied, as already noted, envisioned retaining the traditional numbering of the sacraments and some other evangelical theologians inclined in this same direction. This diversity became especially clear at the end of the 1550s. In 1559, Philip Melanchthon and John Calvin both published the last editions of their major works, the *Theological Commonplaces* and the *Institution of the Christian Religion* respectively. Their understanding of the sacraments could not have been more different. After defining the term sacrament, Melanchthon noted that 'It is not the most ancient practice to list seven sacraments.' He then conceded, 'There are disputes regarding this number',⁴¹⁷ but as his discussion progressed, he went on to explicitly affirm that the Eucharist, baptism, confession, and ordination were all sacraments. In a passing aside about marriage, he wrote that 'if the name "sacrament" is to be applied not only to ceremonies but also to moral works, then marriage can also be called a sacrament, because it is both instituted by the command of God and adorned with

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., p. 488 ('Ego [te] coram hac ecclesia, cuius mihi administration commissa est, te tuorum poena delictorum et excommunicationis exsolvo viculis').

⁴¹⁷ Philip Melanchthon, *The Chief Theological Topics: Loci Praecipui Theologici 1559*, trans. J. A. O. Preus, second ed. (Concordia Publishing House, 2011), p. 256.

such a promise'.⁴¹⁸ In his discussions of confirmation and unction, he first praised their use in the early church but then lamented their current practice, which he considered distorted.⁴¹⁹ He concluded his discussion of confirmation by proposing that 'it would be useful to have examination and profession of teaching and public prayer for the godly, nor would that prayer be in vain', and he considered the act of healing to have been revived by Christ, administered by the apostles, and retained in the early church.⁴²⁰ By including them in this chapter and noting that they could be used well, Melancthon left open the possibility that both might be considered as sacramental in some way. In 1559, shortly before he died, Melancthon advocated a more robust sacramental practice within the churches that professed the Augsburg Confession.

An entirely different view came from John Calvin, who affirmed only baptism and the Eucharist as sacraments. In his discussion on the sacraments, Calvin summarily dismissed older understandings. Like Melancthon, Calvin recognized that in the early church 'sacrament' was used to refer to a variety of rituals, but whereas Melancthon accepted the existence of long-standing debate on the number of sacraments, Calvin deployed invective as he attacked his opponents. He denigrated those who applied unction as 'apes';⁴²¹ he described confirmation as a 'mis-born wraith of a sacrament',⁴²² and penance as 'their fiction'.⁴²³ Designating holy orders and marriage as sacraments was equally misguided. With the exception of marriage, Calvin offered a declension narrative to explain why the other four were not sacraments; recognizing the existence of rites and ceremonies in the early church for penance, unction, confirmation, and ordination, Calvin argued that none of these were ever termed sacraments in Christian antiquity.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., p. 257.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., p. 261.

⁴²⁰ Ibid.

⁴²¹ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, two vols., trans. John T. McNeill, Vol. II (Westminster John Knox Press, 1960), Book IV.XIX, p. 1455.

⁴²² Ibid., p. 1460.

⁴²³ Ibid., p. 1461.

Like Melanchthon, Calvin recognized that ceremonies for penance and confirmation were practiced in the early church, and he believed that they could be revived and used fruitfully in his own day, but because they were not sacraments, they could not be ‘testimonies of divine grace toward us’.⁴²⁴

When Calvin discussed marriage, he turned to St. Paul’s letter to the Ephesians, the centuries-old biblical proof for the sacramental status of marriage.⁴²⁵ Calvin denied that marriage, as a sign of the union between Christ and the church, was designated by St. Paul’s usage of the word *μυστήριον* (‘mystery’), which Jerome had translated as *sacramentum* in the Vulgate. Calvin commented, ‘that nobody may be deceived by an ambiguity, he [St. Paul] explains that he is not speaking of carnal union of man and woman, but of the spiritual marriage of Christ and the Church.’⁴²⁶ The Edwardian canon law listed marriage as a sacrament and the attendant liturgy in the Book of Common Prayer opened by citing this passage from Paul’s letter to the Ephesians; Melanchthon granted that marriage was, in a general sense, a sacrament like any other morally good work; Calvin denied that marriage was a sacrament in any sense whatsoever. In this range of sacramental theologies, Calvin’s embrace of sacramental minimalism was an outlier; the major trend in the 1550s was toward a sacramental theology and practice more extensive than that endorsed by Luther and the Augsburg Confession. If the 1552 Book of Common Prayer is read alongside the 1553 Primer and canon law, the apparent radicalism of the new liturgies is certainly mitigated—but perhaps the Edwardian regime never had a plan of religious reformation in the first place.

⁴²⁴ Ibid., p. 1451.

⁴²⁵ Lombard, *Sentences*, Book IV, Distinction XXVI, Chapter 6.

⁴²⁶ Calvin, *Institutes*, vol. II, p. 1482

Archbishop Cranmer submitted the new canon law to Parliament in March, only to find it attacked by Northumberland and rejected by Parliament.⁴²⁷ Parallel to the canon law revision had been the drafting of a confessional text simply entitled *Articles*, but more commonly known as the Forty-Two Articles of Religion. Unlike the canon law, the Articles received official recognition—but only from the king.⁴²⁸ When they were published as an appendix to the new Catechism in 1553, the title page stated that in 1552, the Articles had been ‘agreed vpon by the Bishoppes, & other learned and godly men, in the last conuocation at London’.⁴²⁹ This was false, and the origin of this claim remains unclear, although it gave the Articles the appearance of official legitimacy. When published on their own, front cover contained the ambiguously-worded claim that the articles had been agreed at a synod in London, and then stated that they were intended ‘for the auoiding of controuersie in opinions, and the establisshement of a godlie concorde, in certeine matiers of religion’.⁴³⁰ The Articles began, in classic scholastic fashion, with the doctrine of God (Article 1). It then continued on with the doctrine of Christ (Articles 2 – 4) and affirmed Scriptural and creedal standards (Articles 5 – 7). The church and its authority were discussed in articles 20 – 2, while matters of worship and ritual were discussed in articles 24 – 35. The text concluded with three articles on political order (Articles 36 – 38), and four articles that condemned heresy (Articles 39 – 42). Major points of recent theological controversy, such as the nature of free will and justification, were discussed in articles 8 – 19. The only article that appears oddly placed is Article 23, which rejected Purgatory. However, by denying the existence of Purgatory, this article rejected the liturgical practices said to affect those undergoing

⁴²⁷ Bray, *Tudor Church Reform*, pp. lxxiii – lxxvi.

⁴²⁸ MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 536 – 8.

⁴²⁹ John Ponet, *A Short Catechisme* (London, 1553; STC 4812).

⁴³⁰ Church of England, *Articles* (London, 1553; STC 10034). On its cover page, the *Short Catechisme* similarly claimed that the Articles were intended ‘to roote out the discord of of [sic] opinions, and stablsh the agreement of trew religion’.

purgation. Only Article 22 directly touched upon a topic long associated with reformation. It opened with the affirmation that ‘Generall counsailes maie not be gathered together without the commaundemente, and will or Princes’. It offered little that was constructive; perhaps against Trent, which had just completed its second round of sessions, it stated that councils ‘maie erre, and sometimes have erred’. But the Articles were ultimately unimportant to Edwardian religious debates. When the king died on 6 July 1553, any arguments about their content, legality, and theology were rendered irrelevant.

VI.

Mary’s accession to the English throne was not guaranteed. Under the influence of Northumberland, Edward tried but failed to secure a change in the succession by giving the crown to Northumberland’s daughter-in-law Jane Grey. For nine days, Jane’s supporters proclaimed her queen, but Mary easily secured the support of the wider nation. Once on the throne, Mary began repealing the religious legislation passed under the previous two reigns, and she arrested those who had sought to debar her from the crown. The Duke of Northumberland, accused and convicted of treason, was soon executed. In the speech given immediately before his execution, Northumberland exhorted England to return to the unity of the Catholic Church. He repented of the religious developments that took place under his command and warned the crowd ‘to beware of these seditiouse preachers, and teachers of newe doctryne’.⁴³¹ Mary’s supporters exploited Northumberland’s speech for what Eamon Duffy describes as its ‘propaganda value’.⁴³² This apparently worked, as many of the Duke’s domestic supporters soon returned to Catholicism. Even those who fled England for Europe looked back upon Northumberland in

⁴³¹ John Dudley, *The Sayinge of John late Duke of Northumberlande uppon the scaffold, at the tyme of his execution* (London, 1553; STC 7283), no pag.

⁴³² Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (Yale University Press, 2009), p. 88.

negative terms. In 1556, the former bishop of Winchester John Ponet disavowed Northumberland's attempt at placing Jane on the throne, and wrote that Northumberland had only sought to 'robbe the king, and spoile the Realme', and that he did so by forging letters 'to make the Protectour [Somerset] hated'.⁴³³ Accusations of greed had stalked Northumberland throughout his career,⁴³⁴ and these became permanent features of later portrayals of him. As the reign progressed, Mary proceeded to burn 284 men and women for heresy. A number of the Edwardian bishops were burned, including Archbishop Cranmer, and the queen's rapid and widely lauded restoration of Catholicism made it appear that the Edwardian legacy would be remembered for nothing but unorthodox belief and rebellion.

The Marian attack upon Edwardian religious change inspired John Olde in 1555 to write *The acquittal or purgation of the moost catholyke Christen Prince, Edwarde the VI*, the earliest attempted vindication of the Edwardian regime. Directed on its title page 'agaynst al suche as blasphemously and traitorously infame hym or the sayd Church, of heresie or sedicion', Olde sought to defend 'the Churche of Englande reformed and gouerned under hym'.⁴³⁵ The semantic struggle in this work did not concern 'reformation' or 'reform' but the meaning of 'catholic'. Olde's concerns are well explained by the fact that he helped translate the second volume of Erasmus's New Testament *Paraphrases*, and many of his emphases directly echoed those found in Udall's discussion of Henry VIII's 'reformation'. Beginning in the Preface and continuing all the way through to the end of the work, Olde drew a distinction between the just rule of Christian kings and 'the violent vsurped power and supremacie of the Romyshe auncient

⁴³³ John Ponet, *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Pouuer* (Strasbourg, 1556; STC 20178), pp. 64, 131.

⁴³⁴ See, e.g., Poore Pratt, *The Copie of a Pistel or Letter* (London, 1553; STC 20188), and Alford, *Kingship and Politics*, pp. 7–8, for a discussion of it; David Loades, 'Dudley, John, duke of Northumberland (1504–1553)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/8156>, accessed 4 Dec 2014].

⁴³⁵ John Olde, *The acquittal or purgation of the moost catholyke Christen Prince, Edwarde the. VI* (Waterford, 1555; STC 18797).

Antichrist'.⁴³⁶ Idolatry, monasticism, and prayers to saints were castigated,⁴³⁷ while the Edwardian Church of England was described as having maintained 'the catholike understanding' of a wide variety of matters, including the Bible, the church, doctrine, and the sacraments.⁴³⁸ Adherents of Edwardian orthodoxy had 'devysed no newe doctrine of fayth, but embrace & confesse the olde faythe with all theyr hartes'.⁴³⁹ Olde did not define the word 'catholic', but his understanding was deeply indebted to Erasmian ideas. Like Erasmus and other humanists, Olde encouraged the study of Hebrew and Greek.⁴⁴⁰ More importantly, rather than referring solely to the Apostles or the Bible, Olde's conception of orthodoxy encompassed later Christian authors, creeds, and councils. Some of this was due to the early church's condemnation of heresy,⁴⁴¹ but the Church Fathers are also presented as having been in total agreement with the apostles. Mentioning Irenaeus, Origen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine by name, Olde averred that 'theyr exposition & iudgementes vary in no poynt from the rules of the Apostles'.⁴⁴² Other church fathers, such as Tertullian, Lactantius, Epiphanius, and Cyprian were also referenced.⁴⁴³ According to Olde, apostolic-patristic doctrine continued through the ages and even maintained institutional expression through the apostolic succession of bishops, for 'Nother is the gosepellers churche without continual succession of bishoppes, seying it hathe her relacion even vnto the Apostles of Christ'.⁴⁴⁴ Built upon an ancient foundation, Olde's memory of the Edwardian church was at once a paean to true and catholic orthodoxy.

⁴³⁶ Ibid., sig. A2r – v.

⁴³⁷ Ibid., e.g., sigs. C – C3v, D4v, E3v – E4.

⁴³⁸ Ibid., e.g., sigs. B5 [B3], B5, D4, E4 – 5. The pagination of the text is both inconsistent and irregular; in this particular case, 'B5' was used twice by the printer. Given the order used, the former 'B5' should have been labeled 'B3'.

⁴³⁹ Ibid., sig. D5v.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., sig. B1.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., e.g., sig. C5.

⁴⁴² Ibid., sig. B5 [B3].

⁴⁴³ Ibid., sig. C3v.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., sig. F2.

Despite his argument that ‘the heretykes (bothe Papistical and Anabaptistical)’ had refused ‘reformation or correction’,⁴⁴⁵ Olde never specified what Edward had reformed—if anything at all. This dearth of exact detail actually reveals something very important. Like Udall, Olde’s celebration of royal reformation was less historical than rhetorical. His use of the term ‘reformation’ certainly fit with the image of royal reformation found in other Edwardian texts, but by 1555, his praise of Edward’s name was part of a narrative that extended back to Henry VIII in the mid-1530s. Apocalyptic invective was hardly new, and despite his emphasis upon the early church and its priority in determining the bounds of orthodoxy, Olde’s commemoration of Edward’s ecclesial legacy simply transferred a set of tried and tested commendations from Henry VIII to the recently deceased prince. This emulation of earlier texts is a further indication of how great Henry’s influence was. The *Acquittal* was an Erasmian encomium. The success of its persuasive appeal is perhaps revealed by the fact that it went through only one edition under Mary and was never reprinted under Elizabeth.

Of greater long-term importance was a new discourse of reformation that arose among those Marian émigrés and exiles who fled to Frankfurt, Strasbourg, and Geneva. In the late-sixteenth century, Geneva was singled out for criticism by apologists for the Church of England, but the location of émigré settlement was less important than the fact that these communities remained in active contact with one another. The ideas propounded and the arguments had in one community were transmitted to the rest through epistolary correspondence. Most important for the long term were their sharp disputes over authority in church and state. John Olde’s encomium on Edward VI was merely a new take upon the much older theme of royal reformation, and in this, Olde simply perpetuated a discourse as old as the earliest praise of the Emperor Sigismund. But in 1556, royal reformation was suddenly and unexpectedly confronted

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., ch. vii, no pag. If following on sequentially from sig. B1, this page would be sig. B7v.

by a call for reformation by force of arms. Although directed against Mary and Philip, these arguments drew upon older material, ranging from scholastic political theology to the events of the Council of Basel.⁴⁴⁶ This new discourse of reformation would shape English history for more than a century.

The Marian émigrés who settled in Frankfurt soon fell into dispute over how much they would maintain of the Edwardian liturgies and ecclesiastical hierarchy. Some wished to retain the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, but others wished to abandon it, deriding the liturgies as full of ‘Papisticall superstitions and vnprofitable Ceremonies’.⁴⁴⁷ As arguments grew increasingly heated, the pastor Thomas Ashley ceased leading worship; some members of the congregation responded by calling for his removal, and ‘affirmed that the church was about the pastor and not the pastor about the church’.⁴⁴⁸ They justified their position by denoting the congregation as an assembly of which the pastor was but one member. The account of this episode was published anonymously in 1574, and its author claimed that advocates of pastoral authority in Frankfurt partially justified their arguments by appealing to arguments for papal primacy. Referencing fifteenth-century history, the wider congregation disagreed with the conclusions of Ashley and his supporters. ‘And that this question (whether the pope was about the church or the church about the pope) was stirred up in the councils of Constance and Basle and was decided also by the authority of the school of Paris joined thereto.’⁴⁴⁹ This was hardly an orthodox repetition of fifteenth-century arguments, but it was a wholly serious use of such ideas.

⁴⁴⁶ For a general overview of the political afterlife of fifteenth-century conciliar thought, see Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300 – 1870* (Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 219 – 49.

⁴⁴⁷ Anonymous [William Whittingham?], *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles Begonne at Frankford* (Heidelberg[?], 1574; STC 25442), p. LIX.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid., p. LXXVII.

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. LXXVII – LXXVIII.

A similar argument was advanced concerning the state and the right to regicide. The first major exponent of this was John Ponet, who was briefly bishop of Winchester under Edward VI, and who fled to Strasbourg upon Mary's accession. Ponet published *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Pouuer* shortly before his death in 1556. Its front cover cited Psalm 118, 'It is better to trust in the Lorde than to trust in Princes.' Ponet's argument was not entirely new. It was a scholastic commonplace that political authorities could, with certain qualifications, be resisted if they became tyrannical. In his work *On The Rule of Princes (De Regimine Principum*, also known as *De Regno*, or *On Kingship*), Thomas Aquinas argued that not all tyranny was unbearable, and that sometimes enduring tyranny was better than overthrowing it, because no society could guarantee that a new and worse tyranny might not then arise. However, in an instance where tyranny was unbearable, the responsibility fell upon lesser government officials to remove the tyrant: 'steps are to be taken against the scourge of tyranny not by private presumption of any persons, but through public authority.'⁴⁵⁰ Officials who took such steps were innocent of wrongdoing. Aquinas further specified in the *Summa Theologiae* that 'it is the tyrant rather that is more guilty of sedition, since he fosters discord and dissension among his subjects in order to lord over them more securely. For this is tyranny, to govern for the ruler's personal advantage to the people's harm.'⁴⁵¹ Three years later, John Calvin, an important correspondent with the Frankfurt community, would maintain the same restriction upon resistance in the 1559 edition of his *Institution*.⁴⁵² Ponet entirely rejected this this long-standing restriction and made the novel argument that *anyone* could take matters into their own hands and execute a tyrant.

⁴⁵⁰ Thomas Aquinas, *De regimine principum*, in *Aquinas: Political Writings*, edited by R. W. Dyson (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 19 – 20.

⁴⁵¹ ST 2a2ae q. 42, art. 2, ad 3.

⁴⁵² Calvin, *Institutes*, Vol. II, Book IV.XX.31.

Throughout his *Treatise*, Ponet drew extensively from Biblical, Greek, and Roman history. He believed that pre-Christian societies, ‘to encourage men to entreprise to kill a tiranne, they esteemed the dede to be worthy so great rewarde, that they thought him worthy perdone that killed a tiranne, though he had killed his owne naturall father before.’⁴⁵³ The same was true of Biblical history, where the justification for such extreme action came from divine inspiration. Ponet explained,

I think it can not be maintained by Goddes worde, that any priuate man maie kill, except (wher execucion of iuste punishment vpon tirannes, idolaters, and traiterous gouernours is either by the hole state vtterly neglected, or the prince with the nobilitie and counsaill conspire the subuersion or alteracion of their contrey and people) any priuate man have som special inwarde commaundement or surely proued mocion of God: as Moses had to kill the Egipcian, Phinees the Lecherours, and Ahud king Eglon, with such like:⁴⁵⁴

Ponet’s reference to Ahud (Ehud, in modern translations) became a favorite among other English exiles, and their celebration of him remained a point of sharp controversy through the seventeenth century.

Ponet recounted the entire story for his audience. An ‘Idolatrours persone and a wicked [king], called Eglon’⁴⁵⁵ was killed by the Israelite Ahud, who ‘thrust his dagger so harde in to the kinges fatte paunche, that ther laie king Eglon dead, and Ahud fled awaie.’ Ponet drew attention to this story because it was key for his argument, and he used a rhetorical question to justify Ahud’s actions. ‘Now, was this weel done or euil? Forsothe the dede is so commended in scripture, that the holy goost reporteth Ahud to be a saueour of Israel.’ Recognizing that some would protest, Ponet remained firm: ‘the scripture saieth, that Ahud (being a priuate persone)

⁴⁵³ Ponet, *Treatise*, p. 106.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 109 – 10.

⁴⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 119.

was stered vp only by the spirite of God.’⁴⁵⁶ Aquinas had discussed this exact same story in *De Regimine Principum*, but he deduced an entirely different meaning from it, first noting that ‘apostolic doctrine’ did not allow private persons to rebel, and then offering the more general claim that ‘it would be a perilous thing, both for a community and its rulers, if anyone could attempt to slay even tyrannical rulers simply on his own private presumption.’⁴⁵⁷ Ponet’s conclusion could not have been more different. By commending Ahud’s actions, Ponet called for the English to rise up against Mary and Philip.

Ponet maintained the centuries-old metaphor of the body politic of which the monarchy was the head, but he relied upon the councils of Constance and Basel to argue that the wider communal body took priority over any one member—in this particular case, the king and queen of England. He summarized the argument of the Council of Basel against Eugenius IV as ‘he is no bishop or pope, that abuseth his Popedome and bishopriche.’⁴⁵⁸ If a council could claim the right to remove a pope, then why could not other communities claim the same against their own rulers? Envisioning a counter-argument that appealed to the ritual of anointing as a sign of unassailable authority, Ponet asserted that ‘argumentes of the Canonistes and example of depriuacion of a Pope, are all clokes (wherewith Popes, bishoppes, priestes, kaisers and kinges vse to defende their iniquitie) vtterly taken awaie. Saie they: we are anointed, ye maie not touche vs: we are only subiecte to God, and everi man to vs.’⁴⁵⁹ A line of equivalence was thus drawn between the Baselean conciliarists and Ponet’s own mission. As if taking a page out of Piccolomini’s *De Gestis*, Ponet offered the biologically impossible argument that because ‘it is naturall to cutte awaie an incurable member, which (being sufferd) wolde destroie the hole body’,

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 121.

⁴⁵⁷ Aquinas, *De regimine principum*, p. 19.

⁴⁵⁸ Ponet, *Treatise*, p. 101.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 103.

kings could also be gotten rid of by the political community. ‘Kinges, Princes and other gouernours, albeit they are the headdes of a politike body, yet they are not the hole body. And though they be the chief membres, yet they are but membres: nother are the people ordained for them, but they are ordained for the people.’ Wholly confident, Ponet even described this principle as a ‘lawe of nature’.⁴⁶⁰ A rightly ordered political body would never need to decapitate itself, but if the need arose, it was justifiable and necessary—indeed, natural. The goal of regicide was to return the political body to its rightful and proportional state.

The corporeal imagery that animated Ponet’s arguments found its complementary converse in the last section of the work, a jeremiad that contained a catalogue of recent ‘monstrous maruailles on the earthe, and horrible wonders in thelement’.⁴⁶¹ Particularly ominous were the stories of deformed children, including one born with two heads and another with underdeveloped arms and legs. Ponet interpreted these stories for his readers, telling them that the child born with two heads signified a country on the verge of civil war, while the child with underdeveloped limbs signified the weakness of the country and its inability to defend itself.⁴⁶² Through nature, God had brought forth visible signs of the political disorder that Ponet believed was rife in England. Ponet was incredulous that anyone would deny the obvious meanings of such signs, and asked, ‘how should they be taken, that doo not beleue the manifest workes of God?’⁴⁶³ Other signs and wonders were then discussed. Eclipses, famine, and disease were all indicators of impending judgment. Comets were as well, and they proved to be a wonder of particular fascination. Ponet drew upon the first-century Jewish historian Josephus, who recounted in his work *The Jewish War* that strange celestial phenomena were seen above

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 106.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid., p. 148.

⁴⁶² Ibid., p. 150.

⁴⁶³ Ibid., p. 152.

Jerusalem shortly before it was destroyed.⁴⁶⁴ With so many strange things seen in recent times, Ponet believed that unless the people rose up and overthrew the reigning monarchs, the same destruction would soon befall England.

The Marian regime had an enthusiastic opponent of Ponet in Miles Huggarde, who responded to Ponet with his 1556 treatise *The Displaying of the Protestantes*.⁴⁶⁵ Huggarde utilized three major lines of polemic, accusing Protestants of both sedition and heresy, which he used to buttress a more general apologetic for Catholicism. *The Displaying of the Protestantes* is noteworthy because it was the most extensive mid-sixteenth century English attempt at defining Protestantism. Huggarde began his work proper with a long disquisition against heresy, which he defined as ‘any false or wrong opinion, whiche any man choseth to him selfe to defende against the catholike fayth of the universall church.’⁴⁶⁶ Protestants such as Ponet stood in a long line of heretical teachers, beginning with ‘Luthers graundfather Simon magus, Cherinthus, Ebion, Basilides, Arrius, with a thousand moe’.⁴⁶⁷ Huggarde argued that the core of the Protestant heresy was error regarding the Eucharist. In this, he continued a line of thought that went back to the Luther’s earliest Henrician opponents. According to Huggarde, Luther ‘had an opinion, that in the sacrament of the Altar was the naturall body of Christe really with the substaunce of bread.’⁴⁶⁸ Unwilling to let go of his opinion, new sacramental heresies followed, including the total denial that Christ was corporeally present in the Eucharist. Huggarde recognized that this view was antagonistic to Luther, but history was less important than tracing a heretical

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid.; Ponet does not name his source, but the story is found in Josephus, *The Jewish War*, trans. H. ST. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library 210 (Harvard University Press, 1928), Book VI.288 – 300 (pp. 262 – 5).

⁴⁶⁵ Miles Huggarde, *The Displaying of the Protestantes* (London, 1556; STC 13558).

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 11v – 12r.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 16r.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 16v.

genealogy. Page after page of other heresies were then enumerated in the work; baptism, the incarnation, and the Trinity were all corrupted,⁴⁶⁹ but the central error was Eucharistic.

In his dedication to the queen, Huggarde noted ‘the horrible inormities of the protestantes’, principally their ‘murmuringe against their magistrates’,⁴⁷⁰ but only after enumerating Protestant heresies did he turn his sights upon the political ideas emanating from the émigrés on the European continent such as Ponet. Drawing upon their identification of people like Archbishop Cranmer as a martyr, Huggarde quipped, ‘Suche are our martyrs in these dayes, who in their lyfe tyme go aboute nothing eels but to sowe sedicion, either conspiracie againste their prince, and magistrates, or els to peruerte the innocent with their vaine perswasions & folishe talke.’⁴⁷¹ Recent work on Marian England indicates that the restoration of Catholicism was generally well received by the populace, and Huggarde may have been an accurate witness to the major political currents in the nation as well. Directly addressing his opponents, he assured them that ‘the reste of your libelles and trumperie, are abhorred of your owne brethren. For they seyng your trayterie & horrible villanie used towardses your princes, do with hartes abhorre both you the authors, and your bokes by you deuised.’⁴⁷² Huggarde claimed that antipathy to the Marian émigrés had even become proverbial, and he informed his opponents that ‘there runneth a common prouerbe in usuall talke amonges us Englishemen. It is as true as the protestantes libel: that is as muche to saye, as it is a starke lye.’⁴⁷³ It is difficult to know how effective such polemic was; by the time that *The Displaying of the Protestantes* was published, the Marian regime’s public opposition to heresy (whether identified as ‘Protestant’ or something else) was

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., pp. 17v – 20r.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 4v.

⁴⁷¹ Ibid., p. 42v.

⁴⁷² Ibid., p. 118v.

⁴⁷³ Ibid., p. 119.

on the wane. Fewer polemical books were being published, and burnings soon tapered off as well.⁴⁷⁴

‘Protestant’ was not used as a self-identification during Edward’s reign;⁴⁷⁵ only in the early seventeenth century was there a small but growing use of the term as a self-descriptor.⁴⁷⁶ There was, however, one important contemporary exception. In 1559, when the Anglo-Scots clergyman and Marian émigré John Knox returned to Scotland, he joined up with those who sought to implement Ponet’s vision in their own country. By the time that Knox began narrating these exploits in the 1560s, he freely identified his movement as Protestant.⁴⁷⁷ In the process of bringing Scotland to civil war, Knox and his colleagues instantiated a new discourse of reformation. Like his contemporaries, Knox advocated the reformation of religion, but it does not appear that he set out to transform the meaning of reformation itself. Rather, this important semantic shift developed out of a confluence of polemical writing and militant action.

In 1558, Knox wrote and published a series of pamphlets that called for the nobility of Scotland and England to rise up against their respective Catholic rulers. The first of these was *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, a virulent polemic against the right of women to hold political authority, and which culminated with a call for the regicide of Mary Tudor. It was immensely controversial, but contained little material about religion and nothing at all about reformation. The second treatise was the *Letter to the Regent*, an expanded version of a letter that Knox first sent to Mary of Guise in 1556. In the original letter, Knox called for the reformation of religion. His revised letter maintained this argument, but his

⁴⁷⁴ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, pp. 60 – 1 (on Marian publications), and pp. 128 – 30 (on burnings).

⁴⁷⁵ MacCulloch, *The Boy King*, p. 2.

⁴⁷⁶ See especially Peter Marshall, ‘The Naming of Protestant England’, *Past and Present* no. 214 (February 2012), pp. 87 – 128.

⁴⁷⁷ John Knox, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*, two vols., edited by William Croft Dickinson (Philosophical Library, 1950), e.g., Vol. I, pp. 45, 72, 126, 140 – 1, 146, 255, 360, 364. This list is far from exhaustive.

additions brought his work into line with concerns articulated across Knox's 1558 publications. One set of additions ran in a sharply apocalyptic direction by describing Catholicism as the work of the devil.⁴⁷⁸ Perhaps responding to the furor raised by *The First Blast of the Trumpet*, Knox denied that his theology encouraged sedition,⁴⁷⁹ but he clearly echoed his first 1558 treatise by offering a brief but clear argument against female rule.⁴⁸⁰

The Appellation of Iohn Knox, the third and final of his 1558 publications, was the most pointed. Knox's argument was twofold. First, at the most basic level, he alleged that his 1556 condemnation by the Scottish ecclesial hierarchy was unjust. Second, and more importantly, he countered the bishops with the argument that political authorities had the final say in religious matters. Knox informed the Scottish lords, 'ye are bound to remove from honour and to punish with death (if the crime so require) such as deceive the people or defraud them of that food of their souls, I mean God's lively word.'⁴⁸¹ This broad claim could have been interpreted in any number of ways, but Knox called for the nobles to apply this principle to the Scottish bishops: 'ye be bound not only to repress their tyranny, but also to punish them as thieves and murderers, as idolaters and blasphemers of God'.⁴⁸² Knox offered no concrete evidence to support his claims, but sweeping accusations such as this peppered the *Appellation*. Recent historical work has noted that Scotland saw little religious persecution or coercion by the Catholic church in the 1550s, so Knox should not be taken at his word.⁴⁸³ However, his arguments should be taken seriously, not least because his accusation of 'tyranny' was a denial of episcopal legitimacy that proved immensely influential on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish border.

⁴⁷⁸ John Knox, *The Letter to the Regent*, in *Knox: On Rebellion*, edited by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge University Press, 1994), e.g., pp. 55, 57, 59.

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 52 – 3, 57.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴⁸¹ John Knox, *The Appellation*, in *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁴⁸³ Alec Ryrie, *The origins of the Scottish Reformation* (Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 111 – 12; Jane Dawson, *John Knox* (Yale University Press, 2015), p. 155.

Knox justified his attack on the Scottish church with surprisingly traditional arguments, but because he made religious division the fault line for determining the limits of political obedience, the divisions within Christendom enabled him to apply very old ideas about the limits of authority to a very new and ultimately violent end. In the *Appellation* he wrote in a marginal note that ‘The matters and reformation of religion appertain to the care of the civil power’.⁴⁸⁴ Knox agreed with John Olde and other advocates of royal reformation by placing the responsibility for reformation at the feet of the monarchy. Drawing upon Biblical history, Knox showed that the kings of Israel had undertaken ‘the reformation of religion’ by rejecting idolatry.⁴⁸⁵ Knox further argued that the nobility should reform religion if the monarch would not. ‘Consider, my Lords, that ye are powers ordained by God (as before is declared) and therefore doth the reformation of religion and the defence of such as unjustly are oppressed appertain to your charge and care’.⁴⁸⁶ Here Knox drew upon the scholastic acceptance of revolt by lesser political figures. Knox’s repeated accusations against the clergy had drawn upon this same set of assumptions, and by accusing them of spiritual ‘tyranny’ amidst the squalor of their vices, Knox’s choice of language imported a very particular set of associations. Tyrants were not to be suffered, and the nobles’ reformation entailed resisting and ultimately overthrowing the Catholic clergy. In the latter half of 1558, previous theories of reformation—whether by council, by pope, or by king—were complemented and challenged by a new theology of reformation by righteous revolt.

⁴⁸⁴ John Knox, *The Appellation*, in *Knox: On Rebellion*, pp. 87 – 8.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, e.g., pp. 89, 91.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

Chapter Three

Dangerous Positions:

Debating Reformation in Elizabethan England

‘the Church of England is grievously charged with forgetfulnesse of her dutie, which dutie had beene to frame her selfe unto the patterne of their example, that went before her in the worke of reformation.’

- Richard Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie*, Book IV, 13.1⁴⁸⁷

I.

When Elizabeth Tudor ascended the throne on 17 November 1558, there ensued another prolonged attempt at defining the English church. This was not just a matter of domestic concern, but had potential ramifications at the international level. Although the queen’s views on a number of religious matters are unknown, it is generally accepted that her inclinations were more traditional. She preferred the first Book of Common Prayer to the version of 1552, and insisted that traditional Eucharistic language be reinstated in the 1559 revision of the liturgy.⁴⁸⁸ Early in her reign, she also participated in creeping to the cross, a popular devotional practice that had been a matter of controversy under Henry VIII and Edward VI, but which Mary had made a mark of orthodoxy.⁴⁸⁹ Like her brother, Elizabeth made the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus a text required of all clergy and all parishes, but unlike his council the queen had little interest in altering the aesthetic face of the English church. In this she ultimately lost and iconoclasm, however sporadic or official, left idiosyncratic but sometimes-extensive marks in English parishes. In her own chapel, however, the queen maintained some religious iconography, most

⁴⁸⁷ FLE, Vol. I, p. 327.

⁴⁸⁸ For a general overview, see Patrick Collinson, ‘Windows in a Woman’s Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I’, in *Elizabethan Essays* (The Hambledon Press, 1994), pp. 87 – 118.

⁴⁸⁹ On Elizabeth’s cultivation of select facets of popular devotion, see Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 10 – 38; for background on debates concerning creeping to the cross, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, second ed. (Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 444, 457, 559.

notably a silver cross. Nicholas Sander, one of the queen's Catholic critics and an English exile living on the European continent, reported that the queen also wished to retain monasticism in England. She 'made an effort to have Religious of her belief, for she asked that illustrious confessor the abbot of Westminster not to allow his monks to go away because of the change, and to assure them of her kindly feelings towards the monastery; that she wished them to remain there, and to pray for her, celebrating divine service according to the order of her laws.'⁴⁹⁰ The monks refused, but this reveals that even when Elizabeth did not get her way, the queen's church freely combined diverse elements from the religious decisions of her Tudor predecessors.

As with her father, brother, and sister, Elizabeth did not begin her reign with a ready-made, much less complete, set of doctrinal standards. The Elizabethan church produced a number of official theological and devotional works. The *Paraphrases* of Erasmus and the Book of Common Prayer were taken over from the Edwardian church, but distinctly Elizabethan standards soon followed. The *Primer*, the regime's first official devotional, was published in 1559 and went through six further editions by the time of its last publication in 1580.⁴⁹¹ Henry VIII's *Orarium*, originally printed in 1546, was reissued in 1560;⁴⁹² a much larger Latin devotional, the *Preces Privatae* (Private Prayers), appeared in 1564 and went through four total editions by the time of its final publication one decade later.⁴⁹³ An official collection of homilies was printed as a companion to the earlier Edwardian collection, and the Forty-Two Articles of Religion were adopted by the Elizabethan church in a heavily revised form.

⁴⁹⁰ Nicholas Sander, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, trans. by David Lewis (Burns and Oates, 1877), p. 271.

⁴⁹¹ *The Primer* (London, 1559; STC 16087); much helpful material can be found in William P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 144 – 7, 233 – 90.

⁴⁹² *Orarium* (London, 1546; STC 16042); *Orarium* (London, 1560; STC 16089).

⁴⁹³ *Preces Privatae* (London, 1564; STC 20378).

No less important were the queen's own *Iniunctions*, which she promulgated in 1559. In some ways, she was fully in harmony with those who opposed large facets of popular devotion as idolatry; the twenty-third injunction called for the removal of shrines as well as 'pictures, payntinges, and al other monumentes of fayned myracles, Pilgremagies, Idolatry and supersticyon, so that ther remaine no memorye of ye same'.⁴⁹⁴ The queen was also attuned to some of the more traditional complaints made by Marian critics of the Edwardian regime. Generally speaking, Elizabeth's approach to the Eucharist was more traditional, and it is helpful to think about her injunctions in light of the accusations made by Miles Huggarde in *The Displaying of the Protestantes*. Huggarde was especially incensed by 'Protestant' approaches to the Eucharist, and argued against their placement of the table, the type of bread that they used, and the absence of the name of Jesus on the same. The Elizabethan injunctions addressed each of these. Noting that some parishes had tables according to the Edwardian law, and that others had either retained or restored their altars, Elizabeth commanded 'that the holy table in euery Churche be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stode'. By combining something new (the table) with something old (its placement), Elizabeth fused Edwardian liturgical innovation together with Marian liturgical restoration. The queen allowed the removal of altars, 'but by oversyght of the curate of the Churche, and the churchwardens ... wherin no riotous or disordred maner to be used'. The conservatism of the Marian clergy no doubt made it unlikely that altars would be taken down in their parishes; in places where altars were removed, the imagery of the altar nonetheless remained. The queen chose to forego placing the name of Jesus on the Eucharistic bread, but she did command that the kind of bread used in the liturgy would be 'the usuall breade and wafer heretofore named syngynge cakes, which serued for the use of

⁴⁹⁴ Elizabeth, *Iniunctions* (London, 1559; STC 10099.5), n. 23 (no pag.).

the priuate masse.’⁴⁹⁵ Here again, the queen fused the old with the new. The 1559 revision of the Book of Common Prayer moved in the same direction. When the priest delivered the elements, he designated the bread as ‘The body of our Lord Jesus Christ’ and the wine as ‘The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ’. No theory of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist was offered although the doctrine was affirmed, and it is noteworthy that the queen took no stand upon the doctrine of transubstantiation in the *Iniunctions*.⁴⁹⁶ Elizabeth’s church would be, in many ways, her own creation.

II.

The queen’s approach to contentious religious matters was not just a product of her own convictions but also a product of her own diplomatic interests. The wider context of Christendom was no mere backdrop for Elizabethan religion. International commitments could either be made or broken by doctrine and devotion. Perceptions of the Elizabethan church are oftentimes bound up with perceptions of Elizabeth herself, and it is not uncommon to read that the queen refused to make ‘windows into men’s souls’. This statement has not only appeared in biographies,⁴⁹⁷ but in the popular and award-winning 1998 film *Elizabeth*.⁴⁹⁸ Given the sharp religious disputes of the time period, the queen’s purported assertion allows her to appear as either doctrinally indifferent or perhaps even doctrinally tolerant—and this makes her church appear the same. However, this is wrong; the queen’s *bon mot* is actually apocryphal.⁴⁹⁹ Tracing the development of this popular

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid., no pag. This and the previous two quotes are found at the end of the *Iniunctions* in the section entitled ‘For the Tables in the church.’

⁴⁹⁶ The Church of England, *The Book of Common Prayer* (1559), edited by John E. Booty (University of Virginia Press, 2005), p. 264.

⁴⁹⁷ E.g., David Loades, *Elizabeth I* (Hambledon Continuum, 2003), p. 137.

⁴⁹⁸ *Elizabeth*, Directed by Shekhar Kapur (Universal Studios, 1998).

⁴⁹⁹ John N. King, ‘Religious Writing’, in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature: 1500 – 1660* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 104 – 31, here p. 104; Patrick Collinson, ‘Elizabeth I (1533–

legend falls outside the ambit of this particular chapter, but we will return to this matter at the end of chapter six. For many if not most living in sixteenth-century Christendom, religion was international currency and the *sine qua non* of both foreign and domestic policy. The wider international scene, in which Elizabeth was a key player, did not admit of the doctrinal laxity so frequently but erroneously attributed to her.

Two major international players shaped the religious doctrine and practice of Elizabeth's church. The first was Catholicism, centered in Rome, and the second was Lutheranism as defended by the Lutheran princes of the Holy Roman Empire. Elizabeth played both angles. From the Catholic perspective, the English church was among those that existed in an ambiguous position—neither Protestant nor in communion with Rome. In early 1561, the pope sent an envoy with a letter inviting the queen to send bishops to Trent, but he was denied entry into the kingdom for fear that his arrival might lead to unrest.⁵⁰⁰ The council resumed later that year, and at the eighteenth session on 26 February 1562, the council ratified a sweeping promise of safe-conduct so that any might attend the council. Having first granted safe conduct to 'those persons linked with the confession of Augsburg', the bishops continued,

The same holy ecumenical and general council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the holy Spirit, with the same legates of the apostolic see as presidents, gives public pledge and safe-conduct in the same form of words as to the Germans, to each and all who are not in communion with us in matters of faith, from whatever kingdoms, nations, provinces,

1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2012. King and Collinson both attribute this quote to Francis Bacon.

⁵⁰⁰ John O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), p. 170.

cities and places they come, in which there is public and uninhibited preaching or teaching or belief against the opinion of the holy Roman church.⁵⁰¹

The ambiguity is worth noting. In 1562, Elizabeth was not yet excommunicated by the pope although it was well known that she had no interest in adopting Roman Catholicism; nonetheless, the Council of Trent still identified Protestants as those who lived in Germany and affirmed the Augsburg Confession. The Council of Trent gave the English church no confessional label. If it is true that the Marian church was integral for the devotional and theological developments that came to define what is oftentimes termed the ‘Counter-Reformation’,⁵⁰² then it is noteworthy that the Huggarde’s construction of Protestantism was not repeated by those at Trent in 1562. In the 1560s, the Elizabeth church neither identified itself nor was it identified by others as Protestant.

Trent’s restricted definition of Protestantism as adherence to the Augsburg Confession allows us to see, however, that Elizabeth pursued a Protestant agenda—or at least something close to it. Extensive diplomatic correspondence passed between the English court and the Lutheran princes in the Holy Roman Empire, and Catholics at court took notice. In a letter addressed to Philip II on 29 April, 1559, the Spanish ambassador Gómez Suárez de Figueroa, known in English sources as de Feria, wrote that in a recent conversation with the new queen of England, Elizabeth ‘said three or four very bad things.’ The first of these was that the queen desired the Augsburg Confession to be maintained in England. Thoroughly displeased with this, de Feria sought to change her mind. The particulars of Elizabeth’s response are unknown, but it seems that she did not find de Feria’s arguments convincing; in her reply, she stated that if she

⁵⁰¹ DEC, Vol. II, 725.

⁵⁰² This is the consistent argument of Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (Yale University Press, 2009), e.g., pp. 7 – 10, 188 – 207.

could not have the Augsburg Confession, she would have ‘something else like it.’⁵⁰³ She wrote similarly to Albert, Duke of Prussia,⁵⁰⁴ and in a letter dated 3 July 1559, Elizabeth wrote to John Frederick II, duke of Saxony, that ‘We have not at any time had anything more important than greatly embellishing the true worship of God among us in these most recent times. Yet we irrigate the deposit once more, and that truly, until it can be made like the Confession of Augsburg, not only in the teaching of the faith but in ceremonial discipline’.⁵⁰⁵ With epistolary witnesses such as these, it is hard to accept the view that Elizabeth was theologically indifferent. The queen’s apparent affinity for Lutheranism or ‘something else like it’ was well known to Catholic exiles such as Nicholas Sander, who wrote that Elizabeth ‘wished to be regarded as one that was more of the Lutheran than of any other heresy, not only in ceremonial, but also in her way of believing.’⁵⁰⁶ These were basically the queen’s own words. Insofar as Lutheranism in the late 1550s was defined as adherence to the Augsburg Confession, Elizabeth I was, as John Schofield remarks, ‘the most Lutheran-minded of the Tudor sovereigns’.⁵⁰⁷

The influence of the Augsburg Confession (or Augustana) upon the Church of England can be seen in the developing shape of Elizabethan Eucharistic doctrine and practice. After 1555, a theological free-for-all broke out within the tightly contained political context defined by the Peace of Augsburg.⁵⁰⁸ Which version of the Augsburg Confession was legally binding?

⁵⁰³ Martin A. S. Hume (ed.), 29 April, No. 29, in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain (Simancas), Volume 1: 1558 – 1567*. British History Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=86705>. Accessed 10 May 2016. Additional consideration of this and other related correspondence may be found in John Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 190 – 2.

⁵⁰⁴ Joseph Stevenson (ed.), July 2, No. 918, in *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 1: 1558 – 1559*. British History Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=71748>. Accessed 10 May 2016.

⁵⁰⁵ ‘Numquam prius nihil habemus, quam ut verum Dei cultum his proximis superioribus annis apud nos valde depositum rigamus denuo atque illustremus, et id quidem, quoad fieri potest, cum in doctrina fidei tum in disciplina rituum iuxta formulam Confessionis Augustanae’. In E. I. Kouri, *Elizabethan England and Europe: Forty Unprinted Letters from Elizabeth I to Protestant Powers* (Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 1982), p. 23.

⁵⁰⁶ Sander, *Anglican Schism*, p. 270.

⁵⁰⁷ Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*, p. 192.

⁵⁰⁸ We might therefore wish to nuance Thomas A. Brady’s claim that ‘The Imperial Peace of 1555 held without serious challenge for a generation.’ Although this may have been politically true, in terms of the wider culture there

Arguments about its theology were also arguments about the legal limits of religious toleration, and it is notable that the late-1550s and early-1560s saw a number of confessional documents written both within and beyond the Holy Roman Empire. These included the Gallican Confession (1559), the Book of Confutation (1559), the Belgic Confession (1561), and the Heidelberg Catechism (1563). Two confessions were adopted in Württemberg in 1559, and the Church of England agreed upon the Thirty-Eight Articles of Religion in 1562. Confessions written within the Holy Roman Empire, such as the Württemberg Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism, directly addressed debates on the Augsburg Confession; the former defended the *Invariata*, the original version of the Augustana,⁵⁰⁹ while the latter advocated Melancthon's 1540 *Variata*.⁵¹⁰ Confessions written outside of the Empire addressed not only major topics of theological debate, but the political context within the Empire as well. When the Belgic Confession was submitted to the Diet of Augsburg in 1566, it was submitted in a revised version which emphasized the importance of obedience to the governing authorities.⁵¹¹ Thomas Brady argues that the proliferation of confessions 'posed a serious danger to the Empire's confessional balance of power' after 1555.⁵¹² Among those eventually known as Lutherans, the balance was increasingly inclined towards the *Invariata*, which Lutherans began enshrining as their confessional norm in 1577. In the 1560s, however, the matter was less clear.

The Peace of Augsburg's 'confessional balance of power' both informed Elizabethan diplomacy and shaped Elizabethan religion. We can see this as early as February 1559, less than

was an immense amount of public disputation and disagreement. Political peace did not map theological peace. For Brady's own perspective, see his *German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400 – 1650* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 233 – 6.

⁵⁰⁹ Martin Brecht and Hermann Ehmer (eds.), *Confessio Virtembergica: Das Württembergische Bekenntnis 1552* (Hänssler, 1999), esp. art. 16.

⁵¹⁰ Lyle D. Bierma, 'The Sources and Theological Orientation of the Heidelberg Catechism', in Lyle D. Bierma (ed.), *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism* (Baker Academic, 2005), p. 101.

⁵¹¹ Nicolaas H. Gootjes, *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources* (Baker Academic, 2007), 127 – 31.

⁵¹² Brady, *German Histories in the Age of Reformations*, p. 239.

three months after Elizabeth ascended the throne. Pietro Vergerius wrote to Sir Henry Killigrew on 1 February that Christoph, Duke of Württemberg, had been upset by ‘some English people who had recently arrived in Germany’ because they were ‘found to have xxvii articles, which differ from the Confession of Augsburg.’ Vergerius did not name the confessional document in question, but his very brief description raises the possibility that the English were carrying the First Helvetic Confession (1536), an early Swiss confession that had twenty-seven articles. If this was the case, then the Duke’s upset takes us back to the fundamental theological problem raised by the Peace of Augsburg. Not only did the First Helvetic Confession lack any legal standing, but by denying that the body and blood of Christ were ‘naturally united’ (‘naturaliter uniantur’) or ‘locally enclosed’ (‘localiter includantur’) in the bread and the wine,⁵¹³ the First Helvetic Confession represented exactly what the Lutheran movement had rejected in the 1520s.

The same letter expressed a further point of dismay, for Christoph ‘heard by letter that the Queen had summoned Peter Martyr’ back to England. Martyr was among those who affirmed the *Consensus Tigurinus*, a Swiss agreement from 1549 which claimed that because no human could be in more than one place at a time, Christ could not be present in the Eucharist while also sitting at the right hand of the Father. Lutherans generally rejected this view. Although Duke Christoph could not have known it at the time, a significant theological debate was about to break out on this issue between Vermigli and the Duke’s favored theologian, Johann Brenz (referred to in English correspondence by his Latin name, Brentius). As noted earlier, the duchy of Württemberg affirmed two confessions in 1559. Both of these affirmed the doctrine of the Real Presence, but Brenz made this explicit by advocating the doctrine of ubiquity, which claimed that by virtue of Christ’s divinity, the body of Jesus was present everywhere. Debates over ubiquity

⁵¹³ The Latin text may be found in Philip Schaff (ed.), *The Creeds of Christendom*, three vols. (Harper and Row, 1931; reprinted by Baker Books, 2007), vol. III, p. 225, col. 2.

raged primarily upon the European continent from the early 1550s, although reverberations were felt in England as early as 1561.⁵¹⁴ That year, Vermigli wrote an entire book against Brentius entitled *Dialogus de Utraque in Christo Natura*; Vermigli dedicated and sent a copy of the work to his former student John Jewel, then recently elevated to the See of Salisbury.⁵¹⁵ In truth, it is difficult to gauge the impact of Vermigli's work in England, for although some English bishops endorsed his position against Brentius,⁵¹⁶ none of the theological literature on ubiquity was ever published in the Elizabethan realms. The 1560s saw little of Vermigli printed in England, and nothing by Brentius.

Diplomatic correspondence from 1561 onward reveals much in this regard. It notes the importance of this debate to both sides, but it also paints a singularly negative picture of continual conflict. In a letter dated 7 October 1561, Christopher Mont (Mundt) wrote to the queen and noted, among other matters, that Vermigli and Heinrich Bullinger had both written against Brentius.⁵¹⁷ Assuming that the queen read the theological material sent to her by Duke Christoph, she soon became familiar with key ubiquitarian writings. In late November 1562, she received a copy of Brentius's treatise *On the Supper of the Lord* (the running header in the volume is *De Coena Domini*), one of Vermigli's primary theological targets.⁵¹⁸ Guzman de Silva, another Spanish ambassador, recorded in a 1565 letter that Duke Christoph also sent

⁵¹⁴ Hirofumi Horie, 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement, 1558 – 1563', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 34, no. 3 (Sep., 1991), pp. 519 – 37; W. B. Patterson, 'The Anglican Reaction', in Lewis W. Spitz and Wenzel Lohff (eds.), *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord: Studies in the Lutheran Reformation's Dialogue of Concord* (Fortress Press, 1977), pp. 151 – 65.

⁵¹⁵ A contemporary English translation of the *Dialogus* may be found in Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, trans. and ed. by John Patrick Donnelly, S. J. (Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1995).

⁵¹⁶ Much of this correspondence is contained in the Parker Society volumes.

⁵¹⁷ Joseph Stevenson, ed., October 7, No. 585, in *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 4: 1561 – 1562*. British History Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=73009>. Accessed 10 May 2016.

⁵¹⁸ Ibid., November 22, No. 1106, in *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 5: 1562*. British History Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=71942>. Accessed 10 May 2016.

Elizabeth both a confession and a catechism.⁵¹⁹ As with Vergerius' letter, details are regrettably lacking here, for neither the confession nor the catechism is named. Nonetheless, from at least 1562, the queen and her advisors possessed key publications that enabled them to understand the scope of this theological controversy—a controversy that directly impinged upon the political question of religious toleration. The Church of England never accepted ubiquity, and contrary to Duke Christoph's understanding, the queen never invited Vermigli back to England, but As Vergerius' letter shows, in Duke Christoph's realm, the *Invariata* had legal precedence.⁵²⁰

This diplomatic and theological background enables us understand the revision made to the Articles of Religion. Under Elizabeth, the Forty-Two Articles were revised in a strongly Lutheran direction, above all with reference to the doctrine of the Eucharist.^{521, 522} This Lutheran-leaning revision occurred by first removing the following substantive paragraph from Article 29 of the Forty-Two Articles:

Forasmuche as the trueth of mannes nature requireth, that the bodie of one, and the self same manne cannot be at one time in diuerse places, but must nedes be in some one certeine place: Therefore the bodie of Christe cannot bee presente at one time in many,

⁵¹⁹ Martin A. S. Hume (ed.), 29 July, No. 312, in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain (Simancas), Volume 1: 1558 – 1567*. British History Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=86773>. Accessed 10 May 2016.

⁵²⁰ This does not mean that those who dissented from the Augsburg Confession were more likely to be persecuted in Württemberg. Brenz opposed using the death penalty for those who dissented from the Duke's religious decisions. See James M. Estes, *Christian Magistrate and Territorial Church* (Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007), pp. 191 – 216.

⁵²¹ A. J. Mason, *Bishop Guest: Articles Twenty-Eight and Twenty-Nine* (Rivington, Percival & Co., 1894), esp. pp. 1 – 27; Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation*, pp. 250 – 2; Horie, 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement', pp. 530 – 7; Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*, pp. 197 – 203. I thank Charles Bartlett for drawing my attention to the Mason volume.

⁵²² Schofield, *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*, pp. 196 – 7, also observes that a change was made in Article 9, which was altered in a synergistic direction to read that God works 'with us' rather than 'in us'. He suspects that this was done under the influence of the 1535 edition of Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, which was dedicated to Henry VIII and which formed part of Elizabeth I's theological education. Synergism was, however, a hot theological topic among Lutherans from the 1560s onward. Because we are concerned here with English overtures to the Lutherans, we must note that the change in Article 9—if it was in fact influenced by Melancthon's synergism—took *one side* of a then-contemporary Lutheran debate. For an overview of Lutherans arguments concerning synergism, see Charles P. Arand, Robert Kolb, and James A. Nestingen, *The Lutheran Confessions: History and Theology of The Book of Concord* (Fortress Press, 2012), pp. 201 – 10.

and diuerse places. And because (as holie Scripture doeth teache) Christe was taken vp into heauen, and there shall continue vnto thende of the worlde, a faithful man ought not, either to beleue, or openlie to confesse the reall, and bodilie presence (as thei terme it) of Christes fleshe and bloude, in the Sacramente of the Lordes supper.⁵²³

This paragraph affirmed the view of the *Consensus Tigurinus*. In the Elizabethan revision, one instead reads, ‘The body of Christe is geuen, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heauenly and spirituall maner’.⁵²⁴ The author of this revision was Edmund Guest, whose correspondence on this article survives. In a letter to William Cecil dated 22 December 1566, Guest related a conversation with Richard Cheney, the bishop of Gloucester, about the Articles of Religion. Guest wrote, ‘I said unto him though he took *CHRIST’S BODY in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally*, as the doctors do write, yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it.’⁵²⁵ The 1559 revision of the Book of Common Prayer affirmed the same, with the consecrated bread and wine denoted as the body and blood of Christ. By removing the *Consensus Tigurinus*, the Eucharistic theology in the 1562 Articles of Religion was made, to borrow language from Elizabeth’s 1559 letter to the Duke of Prussia, ‘iuxta formulam Confessionis Augustanae.’

III.

Some of the most important arguments about reformation in Elizabeth England were advanced through historical literature. Different authors held different and even incompatible notions about what reformation entailed; no less importantly, they could not agree on who had

⁵²³ Cited from Charles Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion: To which is Added a Series of Documents from A. D. 1536 to A.D. 1615, Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources* (Deighton, Bell and Co., 1859), p. 312. This is the official English translation from 1553.

⁵²⁴ Ibid, p. 313. This is the official English translation from 1571.

⁵²⁵ Mason, *Bishop Guest*, p. 22. Italics in original.

the authority to bring reformation about. Arguments about authority were at least as important as disputes about doctrine, devotion, and liturgical practice. In this section, we will look at three different works: the *Commentaries* of Johann Sleidan, the diverse editions of John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, and the *Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland* by John Knox. Each looked at a different nation in Christendom and each author advanced a distinct theological agenda together with a distinct understanding of both reformation and ecclesial authority. Converging within an English context, these texts produced considerable dissonance and contained almost the entire range of liturgical, political, and theological debates that defined England in the century between Elizabeth I and Charles II.

In 1560, Johann Sleidan's *Commentaries on the State of Religion and the Republic of Emperor Charles Fifth* was translated into English under the title *A Famovs Cronicle of our Time*.⁵²⁶ Influenced by the *Commentaries* of Julius Caesar and by the fourteenth-century *Chronicles* of Froissart, which he also translated, Sleidan's *Commentaries* recounted recent German history.⁵²⁷ On the European continent, it was a wildly popular work. By 1560, forty-eight editions encompassing six languages (Latin, French, German, Italian, English, and Spanish) had been printed;⁵²⁸ by the turn of the century, this number had grown to ninety-five editions, and the work had also been translated into Dutch.⁵²⁹ In England, the *Commentaries* were not as popular as this might suggest, and after the edition of 1560, it was not printed again until 1689, although a brief excerpt from it appeared in 1643 during the civil wars.

Sleidan portrayed ecclesiastical reformation as something usually involving church councils but oftentimes contested by kings and popes. In the opening pages, he complained 'how

⁵²⁶ Johannes Sleidanus, *A Famovse Cronicle of our Time* (London, 1560; STC 19848).

⁵²⁷ Alexandra Kess, *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History* (Ashgate, 2008), pp. 23 – 5, (Froissart), 60 (Caesar).

⁵²⁸ Ibid., p. 2.

⁵²⁹ Ibid., p. 74.

oftentimes the Bishops of Rome haue bene in hand with the Emperour and other Kinges, how oft they have put them in hope of a reformation and a counsel'.⁵³⁰ Sleidan placed the brunt of responsibility upon the papacy, but in the books that followed, he discussed a diversity of reformations—a diversity that reflected the disparate sites of ecclesiastical authority and their respective beliefs about who had the right to call a council and thus bring about reformation. Multiple reformations vied with one another for both superiority and finality. In the first book, Sleidan noted that the Fifth Lateran Council debated 'the reformation of the Churche',⁵³¹ and that after the presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530, the Protestants asked the emperor to call a council in Germany, because 'for reformation...there were no waye better than a free and a lawfull counsell, wherewith the Emperour was also content.'⁵³² This latter clause emphasized the importance of harmony between the church and the monarchs of Christendom and thus gave to the emperor and other kings an unspecified level of official ecclesiastical authority. As the *Commentaries* progressed, Sleidan studied how Charles V increasingly took matters into his own hands, and when Sleidan arrived at the year 1548, he described the Augsburg Interim as the 'Ecclesiastical reformation' of Charles V.⁵³³ All of this reflected the difficult diplomatic path that ran from Luther's first call for a council to 1547, when it seemed that the first session of the Council of Trent had been a failure and that no other council would be forthcoming. It also reflected the Lutheran perspective that monarchs had not just a religious duty but the right to call councils and impose reformation themselves.

In the sixteenth book of the *Commentaries*, Sleidan narrated the breakdown of relations between the pope and the emperor, a breakdown that mirrored a breakdown in consensus about

⁵³⁰ Sleidanus, *A Famovse Cronicle*, sig. A.iiii.v.

⁵³¹ Ibid., fol., xix. v.

⁵³² Ibid., fol., xcix. v.

⁵³³ Ibid., fol., ccc.xviii. r.

reformation. In 1544, ‘Whan the warres were hottest, the Bysshop of Roome, at the eyghte kalendes of Septembre, wryteth hys letters to Themperoure, wherin he rebuketh hym sharpelye, for vsurpinge, as he sayeth, hys authoritye, and intermedlinge with the reformation of Relygion’. In Sleidan’s words, the pope complained that the emperor ‘hath nothing to doe with the reformation of Churches but the same to be longe vnto hys office chyefly, whom God hath geuen authoritye to bynde and loose’.⁵³⁴ Reformation was a topic of unresolved contention between rival authorities, and was soon complemented by another argument over ecclesiastical authority: whether individual bishops had the right to call councils for reformation. Near the end of the tenth book of the *Commentaries*, Sleidan first discussed Hermann von Wied, the Archbishop of Cologne, who ‘of long tyme intending a reformation of his church, holdeth at this tyme [1536] a counsell of his owne province’.⁵³⁵ Initially displeased with the liturgical and doctrinal changes proposed by Johann Groper, the Archbishop was put into contact with Martin Bucer who, as noted in the last chapter, helped him prepare *Einfaltigs Bedencken*.⁵³⁶ This resulted in considerable controversy, at least in part because of the Archbishop’s association with a known evangelical, but it was also an argument about priority. The Archbishop’s opponents asked ‘that he woulde staye vntyll the counsell, or at the leste vntill the conuention of thempire’⁵³⁷—a convention that, as the emperor soon stated, would defer religious matters to the pope’s forthcoming council.⁵³⁸ At this point, Charles V was only willing to deal with religious controversy if the council failed to materialize. Councils thus continued to loom large in the background of debates about reformation. It was hoped that conciliar reformation might still resolve the antinomy between rival papal, imperial, and archiepiscopal reformations, but these

⁵³⁴ Ibid., fol., ccxv. r.

⁵³⁵ Ibid., fol., cxlj. r.

⁵³⁶ Ibid., fol., ccxvi. r.

⁵³⁷ Ibid.

⁵³⁸ Ibid., fol. ccxvii. r.

same disputes indicated that the fifteenth-century discourse of conciliar reformation was no longer primary.

Sleidan's lack of popularity in England contrasted with that of John Foxe, whose *Actes and Monuments* went through four editions between 1563 and 1583. In 1571, Canterbury Convocation decreed that every cathedral should purchase a copy, and that all clergy should own the work as well. Foxe held that reformation was a recurring episode in the life of the church. In the 1563 edition of the *Actes and Monuments*, he divided the history of the church into four ages;⁵³⁹ in 1570, he permanently changed this to five, and each age covered approximately 300 years.⁵⁴⁰ In both chronologies, the reign of antichrist had begun by the year 1000. During this unhappy period, several saints prophesied a future reformation, which Foxe defined as the overthrowing of antichrist. In the schema set forth in 1570, the fifth age of the church was a long, unfinished unfolding that included the councils of Constance and Basel. According to Foxe, it began in the early fourteenth century, and when John Wyclif started teaching, reformation began: 'the time wherein the Lord, after long darckenes beginneth some reformation of his churche, by the diligent industrie of sondry his faythfull and learned seruauntes'.⁵⁴¹ This was the dawn of the fifth age of the church—Foxe's own—and during this epoch, reformation became a recurring event. This enabled reformation to begin not just under Wyclif, but also under Luther. Foxe introduced Luther in the 1570 edition of *Actes and Monuments* by writing, 'Here beginneth the reformation of the Churche of Christ, in the tyme of Martin Luther'. He retained this header in the 1576 and 1583 editions.⁵⁴² By locating reformation in the lives of multiple figures from the

⁵³⁹ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 1, section 2, p. 23.

⁵⁴⁰ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570), Book 1, section 1, p. 26.

⁵⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Book 5, section 2, p. 515.

⁵⁴² *Ibid.*, Book 7, section 8, p. 1005; *idem.* (1576), Book 7, section 8, p. 837; *idem.* (1583), Book 7, section 8, p. 864.

fifth age of the church, Foxe mitigated the likelihood that English apologists would fasten upon Luther as a pivotal figure. We will see this play out, especially in the next chapter.

Beginning with the first edition of *Actes and Monuments*, Foxe also communicated fifteenth-century discussions of reformation to his readers. Writing of the beginning of the Council of Constance, which he correctly described as ‘called by Sigismund themperor and Pope Ihon the xxiii’,⁵⁴³ Foxe gave his readers a partial vision of royal reformation.

Here is also to be remēbred the worthy saying of themperor Sigismond, when talk was ministred as touching the reformation of the spiritualtye, and some said ꝑ oporteat incipere a minoritis, that is ꝑ^e reformation ought first to begin at ꝑ^e minorites. Themperor answered againe. Non a minoritis sed a maioritis, that is not wyth the Minorites saith he but w^t the Maiorites. Meaning ꝑ^e reformation ought first to begin with the pope, cardinals & bishops & other superior states of the church, & so to discend after to the inferiors.⁵⁴⁴ This same story was retained in each subsequent edition.⁵⁴⁵ Royal reformation was not a central theme in the *Actes and Monuments*, but royal care for the church most certainly was. Foxe dedicated his work to Queen Elizabeth and began his dedication by praising ‘Constantine the greate and mightie Emperour’ who ‘pacified and established the churche of Christ’.⁵⁴⁶ In writing of Sigismund in a similar fashion, Foxe held forth another example of a godly monarch.

Foxe’s account of Basel was partially translated and partially summarized from Piccolomini’s *De Gestis*. The *Actes and Monuments* thus communicated not just an anti-papal version of the breakdown of that council, but the argument that *Haec Sancta* was constitutional

⁵⁴³ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 2, section 19, p. 235.

⁵⁴⁴ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 2, section 19, p. 236.

⁵⁴⁵ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570), Book 5, section 41, p. 728; idem. (1576), Book 5, section 39, p. 596; idem (1583), Book 5, section 41, p. 617.

⁵⁴⁶ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Preface, p. 5. For a helpful overview of Foxe’s use of Constantine, see Michael S. Pucci, ‘Reforming Roman Emperors: John Foxe’s Characterization of Constantine in the *Acts and Monuments*’, in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Ashgate, 1999), pp. 29 – 51.

and therefore gave Basel (and, by extension, all other councils) final authority ‘all men of what estate or condicion soeuer they were, yea although that they were Poopes them selues to be bounde vnder the obedience and ordinaunces of the sacred generall Councils. And although ther be a certain restraint, where as it is saide, in suche thinges as pertaine vnto the faith, the extirpation of Scisme, and the reformation of the church, as well in the heades as in the members.’⁵⁴⁷ Here too Sigismund was praised, alongside the king of France and those bishops who sought ‘to repress the ambition of the bishoppes of Rome, which exalting them selues aboue the vniuersal church, thought it lawful for them to do all thynges what they would’.⁵⁴⁸ This was nothing if not a polemical adaptation of a fifteenth-century source, but in its anti-papal sentiment, it was not unfaithful to its origin, even if it was more extreme.

Royal reformation was a key facet of Foxe’s account of English history under Henry VIII and Edward VI. Foxe introduced the events of 1538 by writing, ‘the kinges maiesty by his vicegerent the Lord Cromwell, sent out certain Iniunctions vnto the spiritualtye for the reformation of religion, for the maintenaunce of the reading of the Bible in English, for taking downe of Images, with suche other like.’⁵⁴⁹ In subsequent editions, the image of royal reformation became increasingly central. In the 1570 edition, when Foxe transcribed Henry’s injunctions, he labeled them, ‘The kinges Articles and Iniunctions, for reformation of religion’.⁵⁵⁰ In the original document, however, no such title appeared. In the same revision, Foxe added still more material on the importance of Christian monarchs taking the lead in reformation of the church, including a lengthy letter written by Philip Melanchthon against the Six Articles. Melanchthon wrote, ‘Let the harty desires of so many godly men throughe the

⁵⁴⁷ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 2, section 26, p. 313.

⁵⁴⁸ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 2, section 27, p. 372.

⁵⁴⁹ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 3, section 36, p. 581.

⁵⁵⁰ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570), Book 8, section 23, p. 1285.

whole world, moue you, so earnestly wishyng that some good kynges would extende their authority to the true reformation of the Churche of God, to the abolishyng of all Idolatrous worshyp, and the furtheryng of the course of the Gospell.⁵⁵¹ This led Foxe to repeat for his English readers the German evangelical emphasis on royal reformation. Foxe's editorial addenda, together with his excerpts, gave the reader a strong sense that Henry VIII, like earlier Christian monarchs, operated with a clear sense of the king's own duty to bring about royal reformation. In truth, it had not been so clear. However, the antinomy between reformation and idolatry was especially important for Foxe and many of his contemporaries, and it defined the portrayal of Edward VI's reign. In a section entitled 'Reformatiō by K. Edward', Foxe listed a variety of matters: the abolition of the mass, the elevation of learned bishops, and 'the vtter suppression and extirpation of all idolatrie, superstition, hipocrisie, and other enormities and abuses throughout hys realmes and dominions'.⁵⁵² Throughout the *Acts and Monuments*, opposition to idolatry defined reformation. Under Henry VIII and Edward VI, this pattern repeated itself, and Foxe hoped that Elizabeth would continue the same.

Foxe's vision of reformation as a recurring pattern proved influential, although later writers did not always connect it directly with the monarchy. Many authors mined Foxe for a vast amount of information, ranging from basic chronology to excerpts of texts and other historical information. A good example comes from Andrew Willett's *Synopsis Papismi*, which included a description of 'the sects of Friers in many places put downe: the Popish iurisdiction cast out; a notable reformation to be wrought in the Church.' What did Willett mean by 'reformation'? It has been argued that Willett's words indicate that he had a clear conception of *the* Reformation, but at least two other interpretive possibilities present themselves. One

⁵⁵¹ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570), Book 8, section 31, p. 1383.

⁵⁵² Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570), Book 9, section 3, p. 1525.

hearkens back to Nicholas Udall's discussion of Henry VIII in the first volume of Erasmus' *Paraphrases*. However, if Willett is read alongside Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, a second interpretive possibility emerges.

Catherine de Senis, speaketh of a reformation of the Church, & such a renouation of Pastors: that the onely remembrance thereof sayth she, maketh my spirit to reioyce in the Lord. All these thinges we see nowe accomplished: the sects of Friers in many places put downe: the Popish iurisdiction cast out; a notable reformation to be wrought in the Church.⁵⁵³

Willett did not indicate his source, but this exact prophecy was included in the *Actes and Monuments*.⁵⁵⁴ If Willett was following Foxe, then he too may have intended for this prophecy of reformation to be understood as an event within the fifth age of the church. Foxe, by his own admission, had 'no great respect' for the Italian mystic's visions, but he sought to use her words against his Catholic opponents, arguing that the apocalypse was at hand in his own day: 'when was this glorious reformation of the Church, euer true or like to be true, if it be not true now in this maruelous alteration of the Church, in these our latter dayes?''⁵⁵⁵ In the words of Catherine of Siena, Foxe found an intimation of the end times. Perhaps Willett did as well.

In the decade after Elizabeth's death, a number of authors repeated Foxe's apocalyptically-tinged understanding of reformation as opposition to idolatry, which English apologists often connected with Catholicism. Writing against the Jesuit Robert Parsons, Matthew Sutcliffe cited Foxe and described reformation as the overthrow of Roman authority.⁵⁵⁶ George

⁵⁵³ Andrew Willett, *Synopsis Papismi* (London, 1592; STC 25696), p. 68; for Willett and the following figures, see Peter Marshall, '(Re)defining the English Reformation', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (July 2009), pp. 564 – 586. The following examples are all discussed in Marshall.

⁵⁵⁴ Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1576), Book 7, section 8, p. 839.

⁵⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁶ Matthew Sutcliffe, *The subuersion of Robert Parsons* (London, 1606; STC 23469), p. 92.

Downname also set ‘reformation’ in an apocalyptic context, and described it as soon-to-be-fulfilled eschatological reality: ‘the beginning of this seuenteenth century after Christ, seemeth to presage, that the happy reformation of the church, the restitution of the Gospell, consumption of Antichrist, decay of *Babilon* happily begun in this last centenary, shall in this age or century receiue a notable increase, if not a perfect consummation.’⁵⁵⁷ Downname slightly differed from Foxe in that he did not tie reformation to a particular date. He did, however, emphasize the role played by princes in recent history.⁵⁵⁸ Something similar is true of John Donne and Peter Moulin. In his work *Psevd-Martyr*, an apology for royal authority, Donne wrote that ‘ever since the *Reformation* of the Church was couragiously begun’, many Christians had opposed exalting the pope as ‘*Summus Pontifex*, and *Pontifex Maximus*.’⁵⁵⁹ Moulin wrote that ‘the *Reformation* of the *Church of England*, and the *ejection of Popery*’ was the work of God, followed by the English monarchs and finally the bishops.⁵⁶⁰ Neither Donne nor Moulin offered a specific timeframe for reformation, but perhaps they did not need to: every parish owned Erasmus’ *Paraphrases*, with Udall’s vision of royal reformation casting out the pope. It was as if Foxe and Udall had been fused together. Reformation was a revelatory event still unfolding in close conjunction with royal authority.

In the last chapter, it was noted that a new discourse of reformation arose in Scotland in the late 1550s. John Knox’s *Appellation* was touched upon as an early witness to this development, but its principle witness is *The Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*. Although generally ascribed to Knox, the *Historie* has a complicated textual history.⁵⁶¹

⁵⁵⁷ George Downname, *A treatise concerning Antichrist* (London, 1603; STC 7120), sig. A2; emphasis in original.

⁵⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. A2v.

⁵⁵⁹ John Donne, *Pseudo-martyr* (London, 1610; STC 7048), p. 251; emphases in original.

⁵⁶⁰ Peter Moulin and Lancelot Andrewes, *Of Episcopacy* (London, 1647), p. 29. Marshall mistakenly attributes this quote to Andrewes, but the bishop’s response to Moulin begins on p. 43.

⁵⁶¹ Robert M. Healey, ‘John Knox’s “History”: A “Compleat” Sermon on Christian Duty’, *Church History*, Vol. 61, No. 3 (Sept., 1992), pp. 319 – 20, esp. nn. 1 – 3, and 331 – 3, esp. nn. 50 – 2.

Knox was not its sole author; at least eight different handwritings have been identified in the Lang manuscript, the oldest known copy of the work.⁵⁶² Knox wrote the first four books in the *Historie*, while someone who identified him- or herself as ‘the Continuator’ wrote the fifth. The title of the work is also complicated. The first attempt at printing the *Historie* took place in England in 1587. It failed because upon learning of its preparation, Archbishop John Whitgift had the work pulled from the press. Largely complete, it circulated without a title page but with the running header, ‘The Historie of the Church of Scotland’. Later references, such as that found in the 1637 Scottish Book of Common Prayer, cited the header as the *Historie*’s title.⁵⁶³ The *Historie* was printed in full for the first time in 1644, again in England, where it also appeared with its full title: *The Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*. The middle of the civil wars thus saw the first history of a national reformation appear in England—an important fact that we will return to in chapter four.

Knox began composing the *Historie* in 1559 in order to justify the rebellion that he and his associates pursued against Mary of Guise, the Queen Regent of Scotland.⁵⁶⁴ Reformation was Knox’s central theme, but neither he nor his colleagues looked upon it as the work of an ecclesiastical council. Rather, as in his other works, in the *Historie*, ‘reformation’ carried with it the threat of armed, physical violence. From the very beginning of the work to the very end, Knox recounted a tale of apocalyptic proportions in which true religion fought against ‘the generation of Sathan’.⁵⁶⁵ Knox narrated the story of a small group that called itself ‘the Brethren’, and who set out to purge the Scottish church of what they believed was idolatry. Vandalism and the disruption of religious services soon brought the Brethren to the attention of

⁵⁶² John Knox, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*, two vols., edited by William Croft Dickinson (Philosophical Library, 1950), Vol. I, pp. xcv – cix.

⁵⁶³ The Church of Scotland, *The Booke of Common Prayer* (Edinburgh, 1637; STC 16606), sig. A3v.

⁵⁶⁴ Jane Dawson, *John Knox* (Yale University Press, 2015), pp. 251 – 7.

⁵⁶⁵ Knox, *History*, vol. 1, p. 7.

the government; first accused of sedition and later accused of treason, they found the queen regent and her supporters not only unsympathetic but positively hostile to their aims. However disappointed, the Brethren were ultimately unfazed. In a protestation made in Parliament in December 1558, they threatened

that if any tumult or uproar shall arise amongst the members of this realm for the diversity of religion, and if it shall chance that abuses be violently reformed, that the crime thereof be not imputed to us, who most humbly do now seek all things to be reformed by an order: But rather whatsoever inconvenience shall happen to follow for lack of order taken, that may be imputed to those that do refuse the same.⁵⁶⁶

Lest his opponents should misunderstand the meaning of such words, Knox appended a marginal note beside these words that read, ‘Let the Papists observe’. Late the following year, after having engaged in armed revolt, Knox and the Brethren protested against what they perceived as persecution. Writing to the Queen Regent, they asked, ‘what godly man can be offended that we shall seek reformation of these enormities (yea, even by force of arms, seeing that otherways it is denied to us)?’⁵⁶⁷ Transferring old arguments about magisterial resistance to a spiritual elite, Knox’s *Historie* identified the Brethren’s battle as God’s own.

The *Historie* was an account of contemporary events. Only in the opening pages of the first book did Knox discuss earlier history; a handful paragraphs briefly touched upon Wyclif, Hus, and the Lollards of Kyle. After this, Knox wrote, ‘it pleased God of his great mercy, in the year of God 1527, to raise up his servant, Master Patrick Hamilton, at whom our History doth begin.’⁵⁶⁸ A former abbot, Hamilton came into contact with evangelical theology while journeying through Europe in the 1520s, and Knox claimed that Hamilton actually met both

⁵⁶⁶ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 157.

⁵⁶⁷ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 243.

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 11. For general background, see Ryrie, *The origins of the Scottish Reformation*, pp. 31 – 3.

Luther and Melancthon, although this has been disputed.⁵⁶⁹ Hamilton subsequently authored a short text known as ‘Patrick’s Places’, the first major statement of Scottish evangelical theology, although it was published posthumously.⁵⁷⁰ The text reveals the influence of Luther’s strong emphasis upon the centrality of faith and his equally sharp division between law and gospel. ‘Patrick’s Places’ also contained the antinomian claim that ‘No works make us unrighteous.— For if any works made us unrighteous, then the contrary works would make us righteous. But it is proved, that no works can make us righteous: Ergo, no works make us unrighteous.’⁵⁷¹ Perhaps this conviction offers telling insight into why the Brethren adopted such militant methods: no amount of violence could render them unrighteous. James Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrew’s, learned of Hamilton’s preaching and brought him to a conference at St. Andrew’s. Initially appearing sympathetic, Knox recounted that Beaton and ‘his bloody butchers, called doctors’,⁵⁷² conspired to burn Hamilton at the stake, and thereby transformed him into a ‘blessed martyr’.⁵⁷³ According to Knox, the wider Scottish nation did not respond well to this. Some friars soon began preaching ‘against the pride and idle life of Bishops’;⁵⁷⁴ other friars preached ‘against the vices of priests’, and still others opposed ‘the corrupt doctrine of the Papistry.’⁵⁷⁵ Recent scholarship disputes the accuracy of this portrait,⁵⁷⁶ but Knox certainly believed his own propaganda.

Despite Knox’s focus on religion, the *Historie* offered neither a detailed discussion nor a systematic exposition of controverted theological points. In addition to ‘Patrick’s Places’, Knox included other theological documents in his work, such as the 1560 Scottish Confession, a form

⁵⁶⁹ Knox, *History*, vol. 1, p. 12, n. 1.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 219 – 29; Ryrie, *The origins of the Scottish Reformation*, p. 32.

⁵⁷¹ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 227.

⁵⁷² Ibid., vol. 1, p. 12.

⁵⁷³ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 14.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 15.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 19.

⁵⁷⁶ See, e.g., Ryrie, *The origins of the Scottish Reformation*, pp. 139 – 60; Dawson, *John Knox*, pp. 177 – 91.

for ordination, and a list of Lollard ‘Articles’ comprised of thirty-four accusations made against them by the Catholic Church in Scotland. It is tempting to assume that these documents reflected either Knox’s theology or that of his movement, but it is sometimes difficult—if not impossible—to harmonize these texts with one another, much less with Knox’s own stated beliefs. For example, quite unlike the militant theology of the Brethren, the Lollards were alleged to have taught ‘That it is not lawful to fight, or to defend the faith.’⁵⁷⁷ The Scottish Confession also differed from Lollard theology in some key respects. The former defined ‘Ecclesiastical discipline uprightly administered’ as one of the ‘clear and perfect notes’ of the true church,⁵⁷⁸ but the latter claimed ‘That Christ gave power to Peter only, and not to his successors, to bind and loose within the Kirk.’⁵⁷⁹ The Lollards appear to have denigrated the existence of a formal ministry, whereas ‘The Form and Order of the Election of Superintendents, Elders, and Deacons’ expressly defined the ordained ministry as a ‘necessity’.⁵⁸⁰ Like ‘Patrick’s Places’, the Scottish Confession made faith the *sine qua non* of good works, but it also offered a clear definition of sin, drawing from the Ten Commandments and the New Testament.⁵⁸¹ Such disparities indicate that Knox’s understanding of true religion lay elsewhere.

The Brethren were deeply opposed to two things: idolatry, which encompassed religious ceremonies and popular devotion, and the church hierarchy of bishops, which Knox repeatedly described as tyrannical. Knox’s *Historie* added nothing to the diatribes against bishops found in works such as the *Appellation*, but the *Historie* does reveal a considerable amount about his understanding of liturgical ceremony. Immediately after Knox preached his first sermon in 1547, he entered into a dispute with Friar Arbuckle, Subprior of Saint Andrews. As reported in the

⁵⁷⁷ Knox, *History*, vol. 1, p. 8, n. IV.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 266, Cap. XVIII.

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 8, n. V.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 8, nn. V, X; vol. 2, p. 273.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 263 – 4, Cap. XIV.

Historie, the debate made Knox shine.⁵⁸² The friar asked, ‘Why may not the Kirk, for good causes, devise Ceremonies to decore the Sacraments, and others [of] God’s services?’ Knox responded, ‘It is not enough that man invent a ceremony, and then give it a signification, according to his pleasure...it must have the word of God for the assurance’.⁵⁸³ The friar then asked, ‘Will ye bind us so strait, that we may do nothing without the express word of God? What [if] I ask a drink? Think ye that I sin? And yet I have not God’s word for me.’ Knox answered in the affirmative: ‘if ye either eat or drink without assurance of God’s word, that in so doing ye displease God, and ye sin into your very eating and drinking.’⁵⁸⁴ The two then entered into a debate where the friar tried to prove that Catholic ceremonies were ‘ordained by God.’⁵⁸⁵ Knox wholly disagreed and inveighed against ceremonies in his work from that point on. More than a decade later, when the Brethren offered their 1558 protestation in Parliament, they complained ‘that our consciences are burdened with unprofitable ceremonies, and are compelled to adhere to idolatry.’⁵⁸⁶ John Willock, one of Knox’s colleagues, believed that the Devil had invented the Mass, and Knox identified the Devil as the primary force behind the hostility of the Queen and her fellows Catholics to the Brethren.⁵⁸⁷ Opposition to ceremonies was therefore more important than opposition to bishops. Knox never missed an opportunity to lambast the episcopate, but their failures were first and foremost moral. Ceremonies were something different: they were the visible and effectual signs of Antichrist. Among the Brethren, reformation was an apocalyptic war.

⁵⁸² See Dawson, *John Knox*, pp. 46 – 50.

⁵⁸³ Knox, *History*, vol. 1, p. 88.

⁵⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 89.

⁵⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 90.

⁵⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 157.

⁵⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 213.

IV.

Between 1569 and 1571, the state of English religion and politics shifted considerably. Religious uprisings in 1569 prompted the queen to take a much harder line of approach toward those who rejected her religious settlement, and pope Pius V excommunicated her the following year. The rebels of 1569 accused the queen and their enemies of being Protestant and heretical, and those on the receiving end of these accusations began to equate Catholic convictions with political treachery.⁵⁸⁸ When the new Parliament began in 1571, debates about reformation of the English church were brought to fore. Under the influence of John Knox and his English associates, some debates about reformation in early Elizabethan England acquired the connotations of Knox's conception of reformation. Beginning with Elizabeth's 1571 Parliament and continuing on through the next decade with the publication of a series of related texts, the authors John Field, Thomas Cartwright, and their supporters made reformation the terminological center of their desire to bring the Church of England into conformity with 'the best reformed Churches throughout Christendome'.⁵⁸⁹ For many decades, scholars have argued that these authors, commonly referred to as Puritans by their opponents, sought 'further reformation'.⁵⁹⁰ When one turns to the descriptive language used by those such as Field and Cartwright, however, one finds that contemporary scholarship's widespread preference for spatial metaphors—namely, a 'further' reformation—is rarely found in the sources themselves.

⁵⁸⁸ K.J. Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 59 and 115 (accusations of Protestantism and heresy), 156 (the equation of Catholicism with treachery).

⁵⁸⁹ John Field and Thomas Wilcox, et. al., *An Admonition to the Parliament* (Leiden[?], 1617; STC 10849), sig. Av.

⁵⁹⁰ See, e.g., Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 19, 86, 243, 268; John Craig, 'The Growth of English Puritanism', in John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 34 – 47, here pp. 35, 45; Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (University of Toronto Press, 2009), e.g., pp. 40, 136; Stephen Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 185, 207; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 40. Norman L. Jones, 'An Elizabethan Bill for the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Law', *Parliamentary History*, vol. 4 (1985), pp. 171 – 87, here pp. 171, 175, uses the image of completion.

In fact, there was no steady call for ‘further’ reformation under Elizabeth. The phrase ‘further reformation’ implies that Puritans consciously recognized a prior reformation, but no such historical conception emerged until the 1640s. Rather, from the standpoint of its critics, the Elizabethan church did not need further reformation but reformation itself.

During and after Elizabeth’s third parliament in 1571, a number of debates were had about reformation.⁵⁹¹ The first of these was unusual in its turn back toward the Tudor past. According to an anonymously authored journal kept during the Parliament, on April 6, William Strickland called for ‘reformacion’ of

The Booke of Commen Prayer, althoughe (God bee praised) it is drawne very neere to the sinceritie of the truth, yet are there somthinges inserted more superstitious or erroneous then in soe highe matters bee tolerable, as, namely, in the ministracion of the sacrament of baptisme, the signe of the crosse to bee made with some ceremonies, and the ministracion of the sacrament by women in tyme of extremitie.⁵⁹²

Strickland requested that Thomas Norton, another member of Parliament, make available a ‘confession’ written by Peter Martyr and several other divines. The work in question was in fact the failed Edwardian canon law. It is curious that Strickland considered this a confessional document, but he was correct in naming the involvement of Peter Martyr, who had been a member of the committee that produced the intended canons. It is unclear whether Norton discussed the Edwardian canon law with Strickland beforehand—the journal records Norton saying that ‘hee was not ignorant (but had longe tyme since learned) what it was to speak on a

⁵⁹¹ For this and what follows, see Jones, ‘An Elizabethan Bill’; Thomas S. Freeman, ‘“The Reformation of the Church in this Parliament”: Thomas Norton, John Foxe and the Parliament of 1571’, *Parliamentary History*, vol. 16, pt. 2 (1997), pp. 131 – 47; Gerald Bray (ed.), *Tudor Church Reform: The Henrician Canons of 1535 and the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (The Boydell Press & Church of England Record Society, 2000), pp. lxxvi – cvi.

⁵⁹² T. E. Hartley (ed.), *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I*, Vol. 1: 1558 – 1581 (Leicester University Press, 1981), p. 200.

suddaine, or first before the rest of men in Parliament'⁵⁹³—but Norton was certainly prepared to show the work to his constituents. In the preceding months, he had worked with John Foxe to bring a new edition of the Edwardian canons to the press, quite likely in time for the opening of the 1571 Parliament.⁵⁹⁴ They met their goal, and the recently printed work was distributed for all to peruse.

The Norton-Foxe edition of the Edwardian canon law was entitled *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws). Foxe added both the title and a Preface to the work that described the laws as having been republished 'for their more complete reformation' ('ad pleniorum ipsarum reformationem').⁵⁹⁵ This language should not confuse; it does not indicate periodization but the reforming of the canon law. In his Preface, Foxe explained that doctrine had been reformed under Edward VI, but that 'there had not been a comparable refashioning of the laws which would restrain the unbridled impudence of the masses.'⁵⁹⁶ Foxe advanced the *Reformatio* as the 'comparable refashioning' in question. Foxe did not consider doctrine to stand alone; canon law was no mere adjunct but was equally necessary in his mind. He wrote that when the 'best laws' are joined with the 'best religion', they 'help each other to promote the best government in any state'.⁵⁹⁷ Surveying classical antiquity and later English history, Foxe praised figures as diverse as Cicero and Alfred the Great for recognizing this truth. Conversely, he attacked the papacy for proactively undermining Christian monarchy. Like a king, the pope 'gave laws to others and prescribed ordinances for everyone',

⁵⁹³ Ibid., p. 201; divergent interpretations of this may be found in Jones, 'An Elizabethan Bill', pp. 181 – 2, and Freeman, 'The Reformation of the Church in this Parliament', p. 141.

⁵⁹⁴ Freeman, 'The Reformation of the Church in this Parliament', pp. 133 – 4.

⁵⁹⁵ Bray, *Tudor Church Reform*, p. 150. I dissent here from Bray's English translation (p. 151), which reads, like so many other works on Elizabethan religion, 'further reformation'.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 151.

but like a pagan tyrant, his laws multiplied without end and became oppressive.⁵⁹⁸ Foxe named collections of papal canon law such as key instances of papal abuse.⁵⁹⁹ With the excommunication of the queen still fresh in everyone's minds, and with this historical narrative affixed to the Edwardian canon law, Foxe's historiography justified a doctrinally and canonically self-sufficient English church.

Although he evidently intended the *Reformatio* as a blueprint for change in Elizabeth's church, Foxe's enthusiasm for the work is puzzling for several reasons. The first is found in his denigration of papal canon law. As noted in the last chapter, much of the Edwardian canon law came from earlier sources. However, Foxe's 1571 edition did not include any references to earlier canon law, which made its legal content appear more divorced from canonical precedent than it actually was. Several manuscript copies of the Edwardian canons existed and it is unclear how many of these Foxe had access to, but some copies had extensive references to earlier canon law. Foxe's surviving correspondence indicates that he used a copy owned by Archbishop Matthew Parker, one of the members of the original Edwardian commission, but this copy is now lost. Perhaps Foxe did not recognize that the content of the *Reformatio* was deeply rooted in the past, or perhaps he simply ignored such information as inconvenient. Either way, the 1571 *Reformatio* was less a mere reprint of an earlier work than a new edition, edited and presented in such a way that it entrenched and justified the anti-papal sentiment then running so high in England.

A second problem is borne of Foxe's historical narration. The closing paragraphs of his Preface both lamented the death of Edward VI, 'whose name has never been sufficiently

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 157; Foxe compares the papacy to pagan tyrants on p. 153.

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 159.

praised',⁶⁰⁰ and exhorted Elizabeth to do what her brother's early death prevented him from accomplishing. He wrote, 'nor is there any doubt that these same laws would have been ratified and authorized for public use by the authority of parliament, if only the king had lived a little longer.'⁶⁰¹ Foxe indicated no awareness of how profoundly relations between Cranmer and Northumberland had deteriorated by 1553. The third and final curiosity pertains to the discrepancy between Foxe's own view of the Book of Common Prayer and the canon law's assumption that it would remain in use. Like Strickland, Foxe was less than enamored with the liturgies of the Church of England, and in the Preface of the *Reformatio* he argued for their revision. Explaining that there was 'one matter which I cannot overlook or leave to the learned judgments of others', he noted his dissatisfaction with the *Reformatio*'s restriction of worship to the Book of Common Prayer. Foxe offered no specifics, but averred that 'we recognize only the Word of God to be the perfect guide to all divine worship, whereas it appears that there are some things in that book which appear not to square exactly with the need of ecclesiastical reformation, and which probably ought rather to be changed.'⁶⁰² Perhaps there was no need for Foxe to elaborate on his concerns as they had been stated publicly and repeatedly over the preceding decade. In 1565, he was among a small number of ministers who published an open letter that protested against the vestments required for celebrating the liturgy. Moreover, between the first and second editions of the *Actes and Monuments*, Foxe increased his criticism of traditional vestments by expanding the framed speeches of some of his major protagonists, such as bishops Hooper and Ridley, to encompass attacks upon them.⁶⁰³ As with his argument against

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 163.

⁶⁰¹ Ibid., p. 165.

⁶⁰² Ibid., p. 165.

⁶⁰³ Freeman, "The Reformation of the Church in this Parliament", pp. 135 – 6.

the legacy of papal law, so too with his rejection of liturgical conformity: the *Reformatio* was not an ideal text for Foxe's aims.

Whatever the hopes behind printing the *Reformatio* in 1571, Edward's failed canon law revision failed yet again under Elizabeth, but other works calling for reformation soon followed. None of these called for 'further' reformation. The same year saw the second edition of *A Confession of Fayth*, which contained English translations of the First Helvetic Confession of 1536, the Gallican Confession of 1559, and the dedicatory epistle of Theodore Beza's 1565 edition of the New Testament.⁶⁰⁴ Like Foxe's edition of the Edwardian canon law, the English edition of Beza's work was also given a new title, and it appeared in English translation as 'An Exhortation to the Reformation of the Church'.⁶⁰⁵ Regrettably, the translator identified him- or herself only as 'I.O.', making it almost impossible to determine who these initials stand for. The electronic database *Early English Books Online* assigns the translation to John Olde, who sometimes signed his initials as 'I.O.', but Olde died in 1557. The new title of the dedication was not without some merit, as Beza broached the topic of reformation in his letter. He wrote against those who defined 'reformation' as 'a restorynge agayne of those rites, whiche were in use in the florishyng time of the Church, as they terme it (taking awaye some thinges which by the wickednes of times haue bene abused) the whiche except we doo receyue, they crie that the Church is transformed, and depriued utterly of hir beautie and comelinesse.'⁶⁰⁶ Several pages later, a marginal note appended by 'I.O.' stated that 'Christ contented himself with few ceremonies, and so did his Apostles', but Beza's words were more pointed. He attacked 'vaine ceremonies & triflinge Liturgies', arguing that they tended toward 'manifest superstition, & last

⁶⁰⁴ Theodore Beza, *A Confession of Fayth* (London, 1571; STC 23555).

⁶⁰⁵ For the Latin original, see Theodore Beza, *Novum Testamentum* (Henricus Stephanus, 1565), sig. ¶.ii. ff.

⁶⁰⁶ Theodore Beza, 'An Exhortation to the Reformation of the Church', in *A Confession of Fayth*, sig. Diiiv.

of all even degenerate into an Atheisme.’⁶⁰⁷ This line of argument was increasingly prevalent among those Christians who advocated the *Variata* of the Augsburg Confession. Both the Gallican Confession and the Belgic Confession had denounced the continued use of ceremonies among Christians, teaching that Christ had abolished the need for such ceremonies.⁶⁰⁸ Originally directed against Roman Catholics and most of the churches of the *Invariata*, Beza’s polemic, once translated into English, was easily assimilated by those who sought the abolition of the Book of Common Prayer.

A more sweeping set of arguments for reformation was contained in *An Admonition to the Parliament*. Originally published anonymously, the clergymen John Field and Thomas Wilcox were its authors. Field had been Foxe’s research assistant in the late 1560s,⁶⁰⁹ but despite their affiliation and agreement on the need for changing the Prayer Book, Foxe and Field stood opposite one another on the issue of episcopacy. By the late 1580s, Field advocated presbyterianism and reformation, but Foxe had become a defender of the bishops who attacked their critics as a threat to both church and state.⁶¹⁰ The *Admonition* opened by declaring that ‘nothing in this mortall life is more diligently to be sought for, and carefully to bee looked vnto then the restitution of true Religion and reformation of Gods Church’.⁶¹¹ The authors demanded a number of changes, each of which they associated with the abolition of ‘all popish remnants, both in ceremonies and regiment’.⁶¹² They described the liturgy for the consecration of bishops

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid., sig. Dur.

⁶⁰⁸ On the relationship of these two confessions and their shared view of ceremonies, see Nicolaas H. Gootjes, *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources* (Baker Academic, 2007), pp. 64 – 6.

⁶⁰⁹ Patrick Collinson, ‘Field, John (1544/5?–1588)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/9248>, accessed 15 Jan 2014].

⁶¹⁰ Thomas S. Freeman, ‘Foxe, John (1516/17–1587)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/10050>, accessed 15 Jan 2014].

⁶¹¹ Field and Wilcox, et. al., *An Admonition to the Parliament*, p. 1.

⁶¹² Ibid.

as ‘blasphemous’, they called the required liturgical vestments ‘popish and Antichristian’, and they complained about the requirement to recite the Nicene Creed.⁶¹³ In the penultimate paragraph of the *Admonition*, looking north toward Scotland and west toward France, Field and Wilcox asked, ‘Is a reformation good for *France*, and can it be euill for *England*? Is Discipline meet for *Scotland*, and is it vnprofitable this Realme?’⁶¹⁴ It is far from clear that the citizens of either country would have looked upon their local reform movements as good or constructive; in the early 1570s, France was in the midst of religious war and Scotland was still convulsing from the civil wars spurred by the Brethren. By setting the English church within a wider international context, the authors argued that recent events were providentially-ordained ‘examples’ that should inspire Parliament to impose ‘a thorow and a speedy reformation.’⁶¹⁵ This would bring England into conformity with those whom the authors repeatedly endorsed as ‘the best reformed Churches’.⁶¹⁶

Parliament did not heed the *Admonition*, and when it was printed for public perusal in 1572, the editors joined to it several other treatises that also advocated reformation. Like the first *Admonition*, each was published without authorial attribution. The most systematic new text was entitled ‘A View of Popish Abuses yet Remaining in the English Church’. Arranged in three separate articles, nearly two dozen ‘corruptions & abuses’ were identified, all of which led ‘to the ioy of the wicked, and to the greefe and dismay of all those that professe Christs religion, and labour to attaine Christian reformation.’⁶¹⁷ The first article, which identified twenty-one errors in the Book of Common Prayer, was the longest. The author(s) did not argue for the alteration of select facets of the liturgy, but for its wholesale abandonment. The marriage service was

⁶¹³ Ibid., pp. 2 and 4.

⁶¹⁴ Ibid., p. 7.

⁶¹⁵ Ibid.

⁶¹⁶ Ibid., sig. Av.

⁶¹⁷ Ibid., p. 9.

denigrated for its use of a wedding ring and its inclusion of Communion, prayers for the dead were lampooned as ‘supersticious and heathenish’, and the liturgy for the churching of women after childbirth was said to ‘smelleth of Iewish purification.’⁶¹⁸ Other points opposed matters as diverse as kneeling to receive communion, celebrating holy days, and praying for the salvation of all people.⁶¹⁹ Like the Gallican and Belgic confessions, the authors rejected ceremonies because ‘the office of Priesthood is ended, Christ being the last Priest that ever was.’⁶²⁰ The second and third articles were shorter, arguing respectively against the requisite liturgical vestments, which had ‘the shew of evill’,⁶²¹ and the requirement to subscribe to the Articles of Religion.⁶²² Field, Wilcox, and their associates sought systemic change in the Church of England.

The same volume also contained *A Second Admonition to the Parliament*. Like its namesake, it called for ‘that reformation of Religion which is grounded upon Gods boke’. Opposite of it were ‘the deformities of our English reformation.’⁶²³ It is tempting to take a phrase like this and assume that it indicates periodization and conceptualization—e.g., ‘the English Reformation’—but the authors simply drew upon the much older contrast, used for example in the decrees of Constance, between ‘reformed’ and ‘deformed’. Some of the images in the Second Admonition remain especially vivid—‘indeed boyes and sencelesse asses are our common Ministers’⁶²⁴—but with the exception of its repeated rejection of episcopacy,⁶²⁵ the complaints were no different than those offered the year before. However, unlike the original Admonition, the Second Admonition oscillated between denying that England had already experienced

⁶¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 12 – 13 (nos. 9, 11, and 12).

⁶¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 9 (no. 1), 11 (no. 3), 14 (no. 13).

⁶²⁰ Ibid., p. 11 (no. 5).

⁶²¹ Ibid., p. 18.

⁶²² Ibid., pp. 18 – 19.

⁶²³ Ibid., p. 33; the same contrast is made on p. 35.

⁶²⁴ Ibid., p. 47.

⁶²⁵ Ibid., e.g., pp. 54, 58, 62 – 3; opposition to episcopal authority was present in the first Admonition (e.g., pp. 2 and 3), but the second Admonition was explicitly anti-episcopal in a way that the first was not.

reformation and decrying its current state as a misguided or erroneous reformation. Early on, the author(s) explained that they ‘crave redresse of the great abuses in our reformation of Religion’, but they later claimed that the English church had ‘scarce come to the outward face of a Church rightly reformed’.⁶²⁶ This set up the text’s central question, ‘Is this to professe Gods word? is this a reformation?’⁶²⁷ The authors’ answer was clearly negative, for having misused the Scripture by retaining bishops and allowing the Book of Common Prayer, the English church had only ‘this deformed reformation’.⁶²⁸ Almost every page of the Second Admonition called for reformation—but not ‘further’ reformation. From the standpoint of the Admonitioners, an absolute dichotomy existed between the Church of England and ‘the best reformed churches’. Because an erroneous reformation was no reformation at all, reformation was yet to come.

V.

Those who opposed the Admonitioners soon accused them of heresy and labeled them with the term ‘Puritan’. Heresiology was a pervasive feature of religious argument in the centuries covered by this study, but its development and deployment in England are largely unstudied—a neglect that the present work intends to change. Many if not most authors of the period operated with a clear distinction between orthodoxy and heresy, although any one group’s conception of these could easily clash with that of any other. How should contemporary historians make sense of such competing claims without defending one group against another? The twentieth-century concept of a ‘speech act’ is immensely valuable when studying heresiological discourses. In its most simple form, the term ‘speech act’ indicates that speaking is

⁶²⁶ Ibid., pp. 39, 40.

⁶²⁷ Ibid., p. 40.

⁶²⁸ Ibid., p. 55; see also pp. 42, 54.

a performative act, and that speech is therefore about much more than mere description.⁶²⁹

Applying this recognition to the texts here under inquiry, it becomes clear that amidst diverse and incompatible conceptions of orthodoxy, accusing someone of heresy was as performative as it was descriptive, and such an act cast the accused in a particularly negative but purportedly accurate light. The historian should not be concerned with the truthfulness of the truth claims made in these texts, but should instead strive to understand the ways in which one set of truth claims was leveled against another.⁶³⁰ In order to understand the scope of religious debate in Elizabethan England, we need to study heresiological discourses with all of this in mind, recognizing that heresiology was a rhetorical strategy weighted with immense political and theological power.

The term ‘Puritan’ originated in a heresiological argument made by John Bale, one of the English exiles in Frankfurt. Bale compared those who wished to change the English liturgy to the Cathars.⁶³¹ The term Cathar comes from the Greek καθάρως, which means *pure*. Today, ‘Cathar’ is usually used in reference to a thirteenth-century dualist movement in France, but in Elizabethan England it was used to describe the mid-third century schism led by the Roman priest Novatian, who refused to readmit to communion those who had acquiesced under the Decian persecution. Novatian’s ban even applied to repentant Christians. The fourth-century historian Eusebius recorded that Novatian and his followers called themselves καθαροί, or ‘the Pure’.⁶³² The wider church disagreed with this and a schism developed that outlasted Novatian

⁶²⁹ The argument that speech is performative is central to J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, second ed., edited by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (Harvard University Press, 1975). In transferring his argument about speech to writing, I am following Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, Vol. 1: Regarding Method (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 148 – 55.

⁶³⁰ Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, Vol. 1, p. 86.

⁶³¹ Leslie P. Fairfield, *John Bale: Mythmaker of the English Reformation* (Purdue University Press, 1976; Reprinted by Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006), pp. 91 – 2; Dawson, *John Knox*, pp. 96 – 9.

⁶³² Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 2 (Harvard University Press, 1932), p. 112; Eusebius’ account of the Novatians begins in Book VI.43. The English translator J. E. L. Oulton actually translates καθαρούς as ‘Puritans’!

but eventually failed. Foxe indicates that when Nicholas Ridley was put on trial in 1555, he was accused of imitating the Cathari: ‘you know how greate a crime it is to separate your selfe from the communion or felowship of the church, and to make a schisme, or diuision ... this was the perniciouse erreure of Nouatus, and of the Heretikes called (Cathari) that they would not comunicat with the church.’ Ridley denied that he was guilty of both schism and heresy but he agreed with his prosecutor that ‘the heresy of the Nouatians, ought of right to be condemned, for as much as without any iuste or necessary cause they wyckedly separated them selves from the communion of the congregation’.⁶³³ The shared agreement between Ridley and his accusers indicated to a shared point of reference in the early Christian past, and also underscored that each ecclesial group could and did appeal to the exact same orthodox precedents. When Bale used the term ‘Catharytes’ to describe the faction led by Knox and his associates in Frankfurt, he directly invoked this episode from the third century, in which a zealous group of Christians were willing to cut themselves off from all other Christians in order to maintain their purity. In Elizabethan England, Bale’s use of the term became normative.

Other heresiological accusations were soon launched against ‘Puritans’. Numerous texts totaling thousands of pages were published which debated the merits of their petitions. The most important *apologia* for the Church of England in the 1570s was John Whitgift’s *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament*.⁶³⁴ First published in 1572, an expanded edition was published the following year.⁶³⁵ In 1574, the entire treatise was incorporated into Whitgift’s newer and larger tome *The Defense of the Answere to the Admonition*, which also contained lengthy point-by-point responses to extracts from the writings of Thomas Cartwright,

⁶³³ Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), Book 5, p. 1355.

⁶³⁴ John Whitgift, *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1572; STC 25428).

⁶³⁵ John Whitgift, *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1573; STC 25429).

one of the major defenders of the Admonitioners' platform.⁶³⁶ In 1572, Whitgift's initial entry into the Admonitions controversy totaled just under 300 pages; within two years, his work had almost tripled in size. In its mature form, Whitgift added a new argument: that those who attacked the English liturgy were covert Arians, who sought to revive the long-condemned fourth-century heresy of Arius, who claimed that Jesus was not fully divine. Addressing complaints against saying the *Gloria Patri* and the Athanasian Creed, Whitgift noted that 'in this Church there haue bene Arians', and then expanded his point to encompass his opponents. 'I much suspect the matter, not well understanding whereunto these glances of yours at *Gloria Patri*, and *Athanasius Creede* do tende.' Both texts professed Trinitarian orthodoxy, and as Whitgift explained,

Athanasius creede, is not onely an excellent confutation of Arius heresie, but a playne declaration of the myserie of the Trinitie, such as is necessarie for all Christian men to learne and know: and therefore he that is offended with the ofte repetition or saying of either of them, I cannot tell what I should iudge of him. But undoubtedly there is great cause why I should suspect him at the leaste of singularitie and unquietnesse.⁶³⁷

At best, Puritan demands risked allowing heresy to creep back into the church; at worst, Puritans wished to drive such heresy forward. Whitgift concluded this paragraph with the quip, 'I thinke your meaning is, that we know to muche, and therefore now we must learne to forget.'⁶³⁸

Alleging multiple heresies in his defense of the Church of England, Whitgift's speech act proved a successful recasting of the debate against Puritans. His apologetic also helped propel him to the See of Canterbury in 1583.

⁶³⁶ John Whitgift, *The Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition* (London, 1574; STC 25430.5).

⁶³⁷ Ibid., p. 496

⁶³⁸ Ibid.

Advocates for and against reformation published increasingly refined theological works throughout the 1570s, but by the early 1580s, a division had developed between those who sought reformation within a unified national church and those who called for separation from the Church of England in order to achieve their goal. The latter agenda was most famously set forth by Robert Browne in ‘A Treatise of Reformation without Taryng for Anie’. Browne rejected the need for a unified national church, and the term ‘Brownist’ was later used to denote those who embraced separation in their quest for reformation, but Browne’s religious language was no different than that of the Admonitioners. When he announced on the first page of his work that ‘the Church must be builded and reformation made’, his sentiments were at one with other advocates of reformation.⁶³⁹ Like them, he argued against both liturgical ceremonies and ‘the dunge of their solemne feastes, as of the Christmasse, and Easter, and Whitsuntide, and of all their traditions, receyued from Baal.’⁶⁴⁰ Driven and defined by an all-consuming commitment to reformation, Browne’s separatism was the perfect embodiment of the threat posed by Novatian ‘Catharytes’. However incompatible the ecclesiological solutions of diverse authors may have been in the 1570s and 1580s, they were united by their attempt to respond conclusively to the same topics of complaint. At the risk of being repetitive, it should be underscored that none of the authors called for ‘further’ reformation, but for reformation as such.

Exiled English Catholics also deployed heresiological arguments. Nicholas Sander (or Sanders, as he was more commonly known in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), who spent Elizabeth’s reign on the European continent, combined heresiology and history together in his work *De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani* (Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism). It was the first Catholic account of Tudor ecclesiastical history. Sander did not live to

⁶³⁹ Robert Browne, ‘A Treatise of Reformation without Taryng for Anie’, in idem., *A Booke with Sheweth the Life and Manners of all True Christians* (Middelburgh, 1582; STC 3910.3), sig. A2.

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid., sig. Cv.

complete his study, and wrote only about the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Mary, but his work was edited, expanded to encompass Elizabeth, and published posthumously by his fellow English émigré Edward Rishton in 1585.⁶⁴¹ The Elizabethan government outlawed Sander's writings, and although a translation may have been in process in the mid-1590s,⁶⁴² the work did not appear in England until 1877. From 1585 onward, however, it proved influential among Catholics throughout Europe, reaching at least 15 editions by 1700 and translated into a half dozen languages. It was therefore an important text for English apologists to refute, and *apologiae* against it were published through the end of the seventeenth century.

According to Sander and Rishton, the broad historical arc from Henry VIII to Elizabeth was defined first by Henry's schism with the papacy, and then by the introduction and adoption of diverse heresies, particularly under Edward and Elizabeth. Sander's work shared several features in common with earlier Catholic writings, such as Miles Huggarde's *The Displaying of the Protestantes*. Sander's descriptive terminology was central to his argument. Like Huggarde before him, Sander conceived of Catholicism as a unified whole, and the evangelical movements of the sixteenth century as diverse heresies, each of which took its name from its founder. Anne Boleyn 'embraced the heresy of Luther',⁶⁴³ and the followers of Henry VIII were described as 'Henrician'.⁶⁴⁴ More importantly, and continuing the argument of those such as Huggarde, Sander applied the word 'Protestant' to all of these movements. 'Now, all English Protestants—Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Puritans, and Libertines—honour the incestuous marriage of

⁶⁴¹ For general background, see John Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians of the English Reformation, 1585 – 1954* (Sussex Academic Press, 2005), pp. 10 – 22; Christopher Highley, "'A Pestilent and Seditious Book": Nicholas Sander's *Schismatis Anglicani* and Catholic Histories of the Reformation', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, nos. 1 & 2 (2005), pp. 151 – 71. T. F. Mayer, 'Sander, Nicholas (c.1530–1581)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2014 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/24621>, accessed 4 Dec 2014].

⁶⁴² Highley, "'A Pestilent and Seditious Book'", p. 155.

⁶⁴³ Sander, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, pp. 26, 81.

⁶⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

Henry and Anne Boleyn as the wellspring of their gospel, the mother of their Church, and the source of their belief.’⁶⁴⁵ Sander later added ‘Wicliffites’ to this list,⁶⁴⁶ but he spent little time explaining how these movements differed among themselves. Zuinglians were associated with iconoclasm,⁶⁴⁷ and with claiming that the Eucharist could be received sitting;⁶⁴⁸ Calvinists differed from Lutherans in their rejection of images and artwork.⁶⁴⁹ The greatest error pertained to the Eucharist. In Edwardian England, Stephen Gardiner repudiated ‘the heresy of Calvin and of Luther, not only in the matter of justification, but on very many other points, especially that of the Eucharist’.⁶⁵⁰ Sander was just like Huggarde and the Henrician opponents of Luther, who were primarily concerned not with soteriological quiddities, but with the central ritual of Christian worship.

Otherwise, remarkably little was said in the *Schism* about these heresies, which all appeared as particular species within a single heretical genus. Constructing Protestants in this way enabled Sander to further argue that Protestantism’s heretical nature was revealed by its diversity. Writing of the beginning of Edward VI’s reign, Sander bluntly affirmed, ‘all the Protestants were not of one mind.’⁶⁵¹ In addition to being internally divided, they were also inconstant. Cranmer was arguably the worst in this regard. According to Sander, upon Henry VIII’s death, Cranmer learned that Somerset ‘was a Calvinist, not a Lutheran.’ This required Cranmer to change as well, such that, ‘he who was once a Henrician, then a Lutheran, becomes a Calvinist.’⁶⁵² Theological mutability was inherently unstable, and this only added to the

⁶⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 100.

⁶⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 136.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 139.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 161.

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 252.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 186.

⁶⁵¹ Ibid., p. 175.

⁶⁵² Ibid., p. 182.

instability of the realm under the heretical Tudors. Under Edward VI and then under Elizabeth, English religion was defined by competition among the Protestant sects.

Also like Huggarde, Sander alleged the grossest forms of sexual decadence against some of his opponents, particularly Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. As the purported founders of English Protestantism, their alleged immorality made the English Protestant movements guilty by association. Sander claimed that Anne Boleyn was in fact Henry VIII's daughter, thus rendering their marriage incestuous, and that she had also committed incest with her own brother.⁶⁵³ Both the king and his second queen were models of excess and sin. According to Sander, Henry's divorce from Catherine of Aragon was due to his own distorted appetites, for he was a man 'hating restraint and given to wantonness'.⁶⁵⁴ Against Anne Boleyn, Sander alleged that her perversion manifested itself physically. He described her as a monster, 'rather tall of stature, with black hair, and an oval face of a sallow complexion, as if troubled with jaundice. She had a projecting tooth under the upper lip, and on her right hand six fingers.' Her character was just as bad: 'she was full of pride, ambition, envy, and impurity.'⁶⁵⁵ But Henry and Anne were not alone; Cardinal Wolsey, 'overcome by his passions' and 'domineered by his lust of power',⁶⁵⁶ was also guilty. Nonetheless, Henry was ultimately to blame. Divorce and schism mapped one another; Henry 'renounced the faith together with his wife, rather than live without Anne Boleyn.'⁶⁵⁷ From this incestuous and lawless union, 'millions of heretics' were born, and the king and queen 'opened a door to every heresy and to every sin.'⁶⁵⁸ Moral and spiritual monstrosity were the disorders of the day.

⁶⁵³ Ibid., p. cxlvi – cxlvii.

⁶⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 11.

⁶⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 25.

⁶⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 34.

⁶⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 50.

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 100, 101.

Sander and Rishton's *Schism* was more salacious than Huggarde's earlier work, but its most important argument—or at least its most controversial—was not paralleled by *The Displaying of the Protestantes*. Sander and Rishton claimed that the English schism was ultimately the result of lay interference in the English church. Across the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, no error was more important than this, and it manifested itself in the text in two ways: through royal interference and through parliamentary interference. For centuries, the central Catholic position had been that kings and queens were laity, and this view appeared in Sander's work as well. According to Sander and Rishton, England's acceptance of royal supremacy under Henry VIII and Edward VI, like England's acceptance of royal headship under Elizabeth, was heresy. Divine providence revealed this error through historical means. Rishton explained that, God 'brought it about that the government of the Church in England should fall first into the hands of no other layman than Henry VIII, who was a most impious and sacrilegious tyrant; then after him to those of the boy Edward; and then of Elizabeth, a woman.'⁶⁵⁹ Here was a declension narrative—from lay man, to lay boy, to lay woman. In some ways this was like Knox; Rishton also attacked Elizabeth because she was a woman, but her sex was problematic only because of the royal supremacy. Rishton noted that Henry and Edward could both have held positions of spiritual leadership in the church, but Elizabeth

on account of her sex, never could be a minister of the Word, without which the government of the Church becomes impossible. Hence it has come to pass that, according to the teaching of the Protestants, the highest place in the government of the Church is filled by one who not only is not in possession of it—this applies to Henry and Edward also—but by one who never can possess it; and this applies to Elizabeth alone.⁶⁶⁰

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 237; for a similar statement, see p. 168.

⁶⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 237 – 8.

Drawing together the two arguments—that laity could not head the church, and that no woman could do so either—made Elizabeth doubly offensive. Unlike Knox, Rishton did not deny the validity of queenship as such, but his opposition to Elizabeth was no less seditious.

A variant of this same opposition can be found in Sander and Rishton's opposition to Parliament, which was composed primarily of laymen. As with Elizabeth's sex, Parliament's acts were not inherently problematic but they became problematic when they pertained to the church. Only late in the work, while talking about Elizabeth's reign, did Rishton explain his opposition to Parliament's involvement in religious matters, saying that 'impious legislation' resulted 'whenever divine things are handled in human and secular assemblies which have not received from God the promise of the spirit of truth, judgment, and justice.'⁶⁶¹ Parliament was pilloried throughout the *Schism*. Henry VIII severed his relationship 'by the authority of a lay assembly',⁶⁶² Parliament altered the liturgy under Edward VI,⁶⁶³ and Elizabeth inherited the throne through an act of Parliament.⁶⁶⁴ Most importantly and most offensively, the royal supremacy was enacted through Parliament. As far as the authors were concerned, this made the Church of England the creature of Parliament, rather than an independent entity. Rishton alleged that the English church was 'utterly destitute of all lawful orders', deducing that those who sought to be bishops 'were compelled to have recourse to the civil power to obtain in the coming Parliament the confirmation of their rank from a lay authority.' Consequently, he termed them 'parliamentary bishops'.⁶⁶⁵ So too, the Church of England's creed was a 'royal or parliamentary belief'.⁶⁶⁶ Apologists for the Church of England would attack this idea in particular through the

⁶⁶¹ Ibid., p. 257.

⁶⁶² Ibid., p. 107.

⁶⁶³ Ibid., p. 173.

⁶⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 230.

⁶⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 276.

⁶⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 309.

end of the seventeenth century. In Sander and Rishton's view, the Church of England was born of the union between a tyrant and a monster, and its ecclesial body was as disordered as it was heretical.

Behind this attack on 'parliamentary belief' was a more urgent political argument about the fundamental illegitimacy of Elizabeth's reign. Sander supported the view that Catholics in England had the right to resist the monarch by force of arms,⁶⁶⁷ and Rishton seems to have shared this belief. The political intent animating their writing appeared quite explicitly in the last paragraph of the work, where Rishton vowed, 'For the present, let this suffice to show the nature of the lay supremacy, and that the supremacy of a woman, and the troubles it has brought forth; our intention was to be brief. If, however, that supremacy shall again bring forth evil upon the world, we shall not keep silence.'⁶⁶⁸ Such language may seem comparatively tame, but in fact it is not far removed from Knox. Writing after the papal excommunication of 1570, Rishton asserted that Elizabeth was a bastard and therefore had no right to inherit the crown: 'Her right to the throne, therefore, stands on the act of Parliament, and not upon any title which is hers by right of birth, nor has she any better title at this day.'⁶⁶⁹ This total rejection of the Elizabethan government was buttressed by his view that Catholics executed by the government because of the 1569 uprising were martyrs. The first of these, the earl of Northumberland, 'ended his days by a glorious martyrdom in York.'⁶⁷⁰ Other Catholic clergy, accused of fomenting sedition, were also executed by the Elizabethan government, and they too 'finished their course by a glorious martyrdom.'⁶⁷¹ Rishton denied that some of these were involved in conspiracies against the government, but for others he underscored that they were killed because they denied the royal

⁶⁶⁷ Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569*, p. 117.

⁶⁶⁸ Sander, *Anglican Schism*, p. 338.

⁶⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁶⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

⁶⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 314; see through p. 317 for other martyrs.

supremacy. Regardless of the reason, they were all martyrs, and by glorifying those who transgressed the bounds of the law, Sander and Rishton's *Schism* urged similar acts. Catholics, 'Protestants', and the confessionally non-descript all proved the truth of one another's claim: however defined, heresy and sedition were inseparable.

VI.

When describing distinctly *religious* change, *reformation* had neither a shared meaning nor a consistent application in Tudor England. Sixteenth-century dictionaries offer some assistance for understanding why this was the case; they did not always concur on the meaning of 'reformation' and related words, but when they did, reference was not made to religious matters. With the exception of Thomas Elyot's bilingual Latin-English *Dictionary* of 1538, the bulk of English dictionaries were published after 1550. Elyot had no entry for 'reformatio', and his entries for 'Reformo, mare' and 'Reformator' offered minimal insight, briefly defining the former as 'to refourme' and the latter as 'a reformatour'.⁶⁷² 'Reformation' was included in Richard Huloet's dictionary of 1552, but much like Elyot, Huloet's very short definition merely noted the Latin root 'reformatio'. His definition of 'refourme' was slightly more detailed. After giving the Latin etymology, Huloet offered an example, 'Refourme a negligence with a better diligence, *Talum reponere*.'⁶⁷³ The Latin translates as 'put back the die', a statement whose immediate relevance for understanding reform is opaque at best, but Huloet's entry had two revealing precedents. Elyot had included *Talum reponere* in his dictionary under the letter 'T', where it was defined as 'to refourme that, which was negligently done, with more diligence.'⁶⁷⁴ More importantly, Erasmus of Rotterdam had included the Latin proverb in the 1533 edition of

⁶⁷² Thomas Elyot, *The Dictionary* (London, 1538; STC 7659), sig. Xii.

⁶⁷³ Richard Huloet, *Abcedarium Anglico Latinum* (London, 1552; STC 13940), sig. Bb.iiij.v.

⁶⁷⁴ Elyot, *The Dictionary*, no pag.

his *Adages*.⁶⁷⁵ In a paragraph-long commentary on the saying, Erasmus upended its original meaning, which pertained to having a second try in a game. Citing the Greek orator Antiphon, who wrote that ‘One cannot cancel a move in life as one can a move in a game,’ Erasmus elaborated, ‘It is not granted us to replay life once it has passed.’ The most that one could do was perform good works that might ameliorate the effects of earlier, negative actions.⁶⁷⁶ Despite being far from elaborate or extensive, Huloet’s definition indicated that ‘refourme’ could have morally weighty associations.

Further insight comes from dictionaries published during the reign of Elizabeth. Thomas Cooper, who later became bishop of Lincoln, published the first edition of his massive *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae & Britannicae* in 1565. Like Elyot, he too lacked an entry for ‘Reformatio’, but Cooper defined ‘Reformo’ as ‘To reforme: to renew: to bryng the olde state agayne.’ Latin uses of the word followed, such as ‘reformare & corrigere mores’ (‘to reform and correct customs or morals’) and ‘Reformare ad exemplum’, which was glossed as ‘To amende a thyng accordynge to the example or paterne’.⁶⁷⁷ The later editions of 1573, 1578, and 1584 maintained the same definitions and illustrations, but none included *reformatio* among their headwords. Other dictionaries looked more directly to the Roman past and restricted the meanings of words to what could be gleaned from Latin literature. In John Higgins’ 1572 revision of Huloet’s work, ‘Reformation’ appeared and its definition referred to the work of the Censor, the public office charged with monitoring and correcting morals in republican Rome.⁶⁷⁸ A ‘Reformer’ was identified as the Censor, who was described as a ‘Reformer of maners, and of the gouernaunce of

⁶⁷⁵ John N. Grant (ed.), *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, Vol. 36, *Adages* IV iii to V ii 51, translated by John N. Grant and Betty I. Knott (University of Toronto Press, 2006), pp. 468 – 9.

⁶⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 469.

⁶⁷⁷ Thomas Cooper, *Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae* (London, 1565; STC 5686), no pag; see the entry for ‘Reformo’.

⁶⁷⁸ John Higgins (ed.), *Huloets Dictionarie* (London, 1572; STC 13941), sig. Mm.ij.v.

a commune wealthe'. The same was true of John Baret's 1574 *An Aluearie or Triple Dictionarie*, where the headword 'Reformation' simply read, 'made by the censour'. The cognate 'Refourme' was defined by Baret as 'to turn to a better state' ('Vertere in meliorem statum').⁶⁷⁹ For both Baret and Higgins, 'reformation' could refer to improvements imposed by lawfully constituted authority, but these changes were expressly identified as pertaining to *mores*; doctrinal, devotional, or liturgical matters were unmentioned. However, the definition of 'reforme' could also have more playful associations, as when Higgins retained both *Talum reponere* and its explication by Elyot and Huloet. Rooted in less serious concerns, 'reforme' sometimes attained a great level of semantic sobriety, but the force of *Talum reponere* wholly depended upon the Erasmian inversion of the ludic and the frivolous.

Dictionaries indicated that 'reformation' was not a word with necessarily religious connotations, and although etymologically related to 'reforme', the two words were sometimes conceptually distinct. 'Reformed' could be used in other ways as well. One of the most popular theological texts produced during Elizabeth's reign was William Perkins' 1597 volume *A Reformed Catholike*. Perkins has been rightly described as 'the most widely known English theologian of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries',⁶⁸⁰ and the statistics on his writings reveal just as much. Nearly two hundred individual editions of his various works were published in Europe, whether through translation into Latin or one of more than a half dozen vernacular languages.⁶⁸¹ *A Reformed Catholike* may have been the text that most other European Christians read in order to understand the positions of the Church of England,⁶⁸² and the work made just as big an impression domestically; six editions were printed in England by the mid-

⁶⁷⁹ John Baret, *An Aluearie or Triple Dictionarie* (London, 1574; STC 1410), sig. Yy.iii.

⁶⁸⁰ W. Brown Patterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England* (Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 41.

⁶⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁶⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

1630s,⁶⁸³ and the term ‘Reformed Catholic’ became a designation used by some English Christians into the late seventeenth century.⁶⁸⁴

In his opening address to the reader, Perkins defined his key term as ‘*any one that holds the same necessarie heades of religion with the Romane Church: yet so, as he pares off and reiects all errours in doctrine whereby the said religion is corrupted.*’⁶⁸⁵ The twenty-two chapters that followed each touched upon a particular issue of dispute between the English and Roman churches. They were not arranged in order of importance but each individual chapter was organized in a broadly scholastic fashion, beginning with a definition of the key term; the second section discussed points of consent between the two churches; the third covered points of dissent, and the chapter concluded with a discussion of Catholic objections, in which Perkins anticipated and then sought to resolve the counterarguments of any potential Catholic interlocutors. The end result was a remarkably clear presentation that proved equally influential.

A Reformed Catholike perfectly illustrated Thomas Cooper’s definition that ‘reforme’ meant ‘to bryng the olde state agayne.’ Perkins offered no guidelines for how to reform, but throughout his work he defended the Church of England in a twofold fashion, first by drawing from the Bible and second by drawing from long-recognized theological authorities. In his seventh chapter, ‘Of Traditions’, Perkins offered an expansive definition of his key term: ‘Traditions, are doctrine deliuered from hand to hand, either by word of mouth, or by writing, beside the written word of God.’ Perkins began his first point of consent by writing, ‘We hold that the very word of God, hath beene deliuered by tradition.’⁶⁸⁶ Key points of Christian tradition

⁶⁸³ Ibid.

⁶⁸⁴ See, e.g., Richard Baxter, *Full and Easy Satisfaction* (London, 1674); Roger L’Estrange, *The Reformed Catholique: Or, The True Protestant* (London, 1679). Baxter’s work features a dialogue between several characters, including ‘a reformed Catholick Christian’.

⁶⁸⁵ William Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike* (London, 1598; STC 19736), no pag.

⁶⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 134.

included ‘that the virgine Marie liued and died a virgine. And in Ecclesiasticall writers many worthy sayings of the Apostles and other holy men are recorded, and receiued of vs for truth, which neuertheles are not set downe in the bookes of the old or new Testament.’⁶⁸⁷ *A Reformed Catholike* abounds with citations of such early Christian authorities as Augustine,⁶⁸⁸ Chrysostom,⁶⁸⁹ and Jerome,⁶⁹⁰ as well as a much smaller number of later figures, particularly Bernard of Clairvaux.⁶⁹¹ Scholastic writers almost never appeared; Peter Lombard was cited twice,⁶⁹² while Anselm of Canterbury and Gabriel Biel were cited but once each.⁶⁹³ Remarkably, the fourteenth-century Byzantine author Nicholas Cabasilas was cited once,⁶⁹⁴ and modern western authors such as Petrarch, Melanchthon, Calvin, and Luther were also cited one time each.⁶⁹⁵ With Augustine the uncontested center of theological gravity, Perkins’ broad conception of tradition enabled him to place a heavy emphasis upon the early church, particularly the period of the four ecumenical councils. With the lone exception of Bernard of Clairvaux, Perkins placed comparatively little emphasis upon the intervening centuries. His invocations of early Christian figures sought ‘to bryng the olde state agayne.’

Perkins argued that Eucharistic doctrine was the fundamental difference between the English and Roman churches. No reference was made to the history of events during the reigns of Henry VIII or his children. Perkins’ position proved immensely influential and remained vitally important for English apologists through at least the middle of the seventeenth century. Perkins devoted his tenth and eleventh chapters to the Eucharist, and their arguments were

⁶⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 136.

⁶⁸⁸ Ibid., e.g., pp. 13, 15, 24, 32 – 3, 36, 49, 57, 71, 80, 90, 109, 124 – 5, 142, 149, 165, 181, 184, 190 – 1, 192 – 3, 203 – 4, 206, 207, 255, 262 – 3, 280, 329.

⁶⁸⁹ Ibid., e.g., pp. 49, 69, 70, 75, 90, 125, 126, 254, 263, 280, 292, 327, 329.

⁶⁹⁰ Ibid., e.g., pp. 69, 125, 141, 176, 207.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid., e.g., pp. 7, 24, 49, 50 – 1, 58, 71, 80, 109, 238, 293.

⁶⁹² Ibid., pp. 265, 322.

⁶⁹³ Ibid., pp. 69 (Anselm), 120 (Biel).

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 198.

⁶⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 9 (Petrarch), 270 (Melanchthon), 274 (Calvin), 332 (Luther)

closely intertwined. In chapter ten, Perkins agreed with the Roman church that Christ was present in the Eucharist but denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, arguing that ‘in euery sacrament there must be a signe, a thing signified, and a proportion or relation betweene them both.’ However, he continued, in the doctrine of transubstantiation ‘the signe is abolished, and there remaines nothing but the outwarde formes or appearance of breade and wine.’⁶⁹⁶ In losing the distinction between sign and signified, the Church of Rome lost the very meaning of a sacrament and thus the Eucharist itself.

The eleventh chapter turned to the more central issue of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Perkins agreed that the Eucharist was a sacrifice and that the ritual acts performed by the English clergy also signified its sacrificial nature. ‘For as we take the bread to be the bodie of Christ sacramentally by resemblance and no otherwise: so the breaking of bread is sacramentally the sacrificing or offering of Christ vpon the crosse.’⁶⁹⁷ This was the central difference: Roman Catholics ‘make the Eucharist to be a reall, externall, or bodily sacrifice offered vnto God’⁶⁹⁸ in which, through transubstantiation, Christ’s physical body was broken by the priest. Underscoring the difference between a ‘sacramental’ sacrifice and a ‘reall’ sacrifice, Perkins explained,

We acknowledge no reall, outward, or bodily sacrifice for the remission of sinnes, but onely Christs oblation on the crosse once offered. Here is the maine difference betweene vs, touching this point and it is of that waight and moment, that they stiffely maintaining their opinion (as they doe) can be no Church of God. For this point raseth the foundation to the very bottom.⁶⁹⁹

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 193.

⁶⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 206.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 207.

⁶⁹⁹ Ibid., pp. 207 – 8.

For modern readers, this may seem to split sacramental hairs, but for Perkins the difference was so profound that it necessarily divided the English and Roman churches. In this chapter, Perkins cited Augustine three times, six other early Christian authorities once,⁷⁰⁰ and canons from three regional councils.⁷⁰¹ All of these dated from the sixth century or before. However fine the distinctions, Perkins portrayed *Reformed* Catholics differing from *Roman* Catholics in that the former maintained early Christian doctrine and practice, while the latter did not.

VII.

The early-mid 1590s saw a new wave of apologetics published in defense of the Church of England. Among these was *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings*, an early text by Richard Bancroft, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1604. In his single-page preface, ‘An Advertisement to the Reader’, Bancroft voiced a suspicion that had an afterlife that extended into the eighteenth century: that Puritans really advocated ‘under pretence of reformation’.⁷⁰² *Dangerous Positions* was an exposé concerned with showing that Puritans not only acted in bad faith but were proactively attempting to undermine the English nation and its church. They were described as ‘pretended reformers’ who advocated a ‘pretended discipline’,⁷⁰³ who were motivated by ‘pretence of religion’ and ‘more political then Christian practises’.⁷⁰⁴ Whereas the Admonitioners understood reformation as a good thing, Bancroft inverted their meaning and thereby used ‘reformation’ to make its supporters appear dishonest and treacherous. For Bancroft, reformation was not necessarily good. All reformation was connected with the

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 206 – 7 (Augustine, three times), 207 (Ambrose and Jerome), 214 (Paschasius), 218 (Justin Martyr), 219 (Tertullian and Irenaeus); the councils

⁷⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 207 (Matiscon), 213 (Toledo and Milevis).

⁷⁰² Richard Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* (London, 1593; STC 1344), sig. A2.

⁷⁰³ Ibid., for ‘pretended reformers’, see e.g., pp. 3, 5, 14, 44, 47; for ‘pretended discipline’, see e.g., pp. 53, 88, 94 – 5, 96, 176; see also pp. 128, 136 for ‘pretended reformation’.

⁷⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 23, 62.

rejection of papal primacy,⁷⁰⁵ but individual reformations could be qualitatively different. However romantic the claim may now appear, Bancroft argued that under Edward VI and Elizabeth I, reformation was lawful and peaceful.⁷⁰⁶ But ‘Genevian Reformation’ was suspect, and Bancroft spent a considerable amount of time drawing lines of connection between Geneva, where John Calvin had resided for much of his career, and Scotland, where the Brethren had wrought their revolutionary reformation.⁷⁰⁷ Like the Admonitioners, Bancroft situated his argument and the Church of England within a wider international context, but from this he drew a diametrically opposite set of conclusions. ‘Scottish Genevating for Reformation’, which animated England’s ‘pretended reformers’, was a threat in desperate need of containment.⁷⁰⁸

Dangerous Positions was divided into four books. The first offers a heresiological argument that purports to trace the development and transmission of erroneous religious ideas from Geneva through Scotland and finally to Bancroft’s English opponents. As Bancroft told the story, ‘the Genevian rules of Reformation’ were predicated upon regicide, which made Geneva ‘contrary to the iudgement of all other reformed Churches’.⁷⁰⁹ Geneva’s political theology thus violated the bond of a common reformed faith. Under the leadership of John Knox, Scotland had rejected the same peaceful consensus, setting out ‘by a violent and forcible course to reforme Religion.’⁷¹⁰ Much depends upon how seriously we take these claims. Peter Lake has largely dismissed the viability of ‘Bancroft’s portrait of a ‘Scottizing’ conspiracy’, but the most recent investigation of the Scottish ‘reformation’ has emphasized the violence and social instability that resulted from it.⁷¹¹ Bancroft and others had good reason to look upon contemporary Scotland as a

⁷⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 8, 41.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 39 for Edward VI; pp. 1, 41, 46 for Elizabeth I.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid., this is the running header on pp. 8 – 9.

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid., this is the running header on pp. 10 – 17.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

⁷¹⁰ Ibid., p. 10.

⁷¹¹ Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, p. 76; cf. Ryrie, *Scottish Reformation*, e.g., pp. 126, 151, 197.

political and religious threat. He certainly did his homework; in his discussion of ‘Scottish Genevating’, he cited John Knox’s writings, particularly *The Historie of the Church of Scotland*, dozens of times. He later turned to the writings of George Buchanan and other Scottish theologians to support his arguments about the danger of the regicidal political theology then prevalent in Scotland. Moreover, he was correct in reporting that Knox and his allies had rebelled against Mary I of Scotland, and that during the reign of her son James VI, relations had again broke down between the king and the ‘Scottish reforming ministers’.⁷¹² These recent and repeated historical episodes exemplified the seriousness of the danger posed by England’s northern neighbor.

Bancroft’s label ‘Scottish reforming ministers’ laid the conceptual foundation for the remaining three books, which examined in greater detail the likelihood that ‘our pretended reformers in England’ would also pursue ideologically-driven terror and lawlessness.⁷¹³ At the beginning of the second book, Bancroft argued that just as the Brethren ‘proceeded to reforme Religion in Scotland by force and armes’, some English clergy were pursuing a ‘like course for reformation in England’.⁷¹⁴ Here again Bancroft used his familiarity with key texts to support his argument. The second book consisted of numerous excerpts—glossed by Bancroft as ‘wicked and slaunderous speeches’⁷¹⁵—from the writings of suspect English and Scottish authors. The same was true of the third book, which contained extensive selections from English Puritans interspersed with discussions of key developments in England during the reign of Elizabeth. Noting that ‘our English reformers, and their imitation of the Ministers in *Scotland*’ had failed to

⁷¹² Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions*, pp. 27 – 30.

⁷¹³ Ibid., e.g., p. 33, 94, 128.

⁷¹⁴ Ibid., p. 34. The latter quote comes from the title of Book II, Ch. 1.

⁷¹⁵ Ibid., p. 61.

bring about reformation,⁷¹⁶ Bancroft turned in the fourth and final book to analyzing Presbyterian discipline. ‘You see indeede their hearts’, he writes. ‘And is it not then euident whereat they ayme?’⁷¹⁷ As with the first three books, Bancroft again employed subversive writings to argue his point. He cited the pseudonymous pamphleteer Martin Marprelate, who had alleged that according to the English bishops, ‘reformation cannot well come to our Church, without blood.’⁷¹⁸ Bancroft did not pass over these words but instead discerned murderous intent and alleged that Marprelate’s accusation actually indicated his own desire and willingness to inflict violence. Bancroft returned to the image of blood in later chapters of the fourth book, and he finally summarized Puritan designs as ‘illusions of Sathan, cruel, bloody, & trayterous’.⁷¹⁹ Was this mere fear mongering? Several times in the fourth book, Bancroft interrupted his narrative by concluding individual chapters with prayers for deliverance. The same was true of the final chapter of book four, which also concludes the treatise.⁷²⁰ Rhetorically no less than pastorally persuasive, Bancroft’s supplications were much more than merely manipulative propaganda. Bancroft feared ‘Scottish Genevating for Reformation’ and its English sympathizers.

Of all the Elizabethan literature published either for or against reformation, Richard Hooker’s multi-volume *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie* had the greatest afterlife. Given its content, this is surprising. Hooker’s tome was the most philosophically dense of all the material related to these debates. It was also among the longest; the most recent edition of Hooker’s *Lawes* totals more than 1,000 pages. The print history the *Lawes* is, furthermore, quite complicated, which makes its afterlife even more remarkable. Hooker intended the *Lawes* to comprise eight books. The first four were published together with a preface in 1593, and the fifth

⁷¹⁶ Ibid., p. 128.

⁷¹⁷ Ibid., p. 138.

⁷¹⁸ Ibid., p. 140.

⁷¹⁹ Ibid., p. 176; see also p. 169.

⁷²⁰ Ibid., e.g., pp. 141, 168, 182 – 3.

book, published in 1597, was larger than the sum total of those published four years earlier. Despite his ambitions, the remainder of the *Lawes* was incomplete when Hooker died in 1600, but manuscript drafts of the remaining three books were preserved, circulated, and eventually printed over the course of the mid-seventeenth century.⁷²¹ Because the print history of the last three books is so intricate, and because they could not influence debate until decades later when they were printed, we will leave them aside in our present discussion.

Hooker addressed his work ‘To them that seeke (as they tearme it) the reformation of Lawes, and orders Ecclesiasticall, in the Church of England.’⁷²² Like Baxter, the *Lawes* began with a discussion of the relationship between Geneva and Scotland, but unlike *Dangerous Positions*, Hooker aimed to do much more than point out the subversive nature of the Admonitioners’ demands. He was at one with Baxter in attacking his opponents’ motives; accusations of ‘pretended reformation’ occasionally appeared in the *Lawes*, as did critiques of the ‘pretended prooffe’ offered by Puritan citations of the Bible.⁷²³ But this was not the norm. Rather, because the Admonitioners sought ‘the reformation of Lawes, and orders Ecclesiasticall’, Hooker’s discourse opened by discussing the nature of law itself. In the first book of the *Lawes*, Hooker followed Thomas Aquinas in distinguishing between multiple kinds of law, all of which originated in God.⁷²⁴ The first eternal law concerned God himself, while the second eternal law comprised those laws that direct creation. Within the life of a *polis*, a twofold distinction held between divine law, which ‘is not knowen but by speciall revelation from God’, and ‘humane law’ which came ‘out of the law either of reason or of God’ and was used by human beings to

⁷²¹ For a helpful overview of these issues with special reference to the 17th c., see Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses 1600 – 1714* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁷²² FLE, Preface; vol. I, p. 1.

⁷²³ Ibid., e.g., IV.7.4 (‘pretended reformation’) and II.1.3 (‘pretended prooffe’); vol. I, pp. 295, 146.

⁷²⁴ ST, 1a2ae q. 91; W. J. Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker, Reformer and Platonist* (Ashgate, 2005), pp. 45 – 56.

order their respective communities.⁷²⁵ Hooker concluded the first book of the *Lawes* with a hymn to law, whose ‘seat is the bosome of God, her voyce the harmony of the world’. This was the very order of nature itself, where ‘all thinges in heaven and earth doe her homage’, because they recognized her ‘as the mother of their peace and joy.’⁷²⁶ With such a vision of law, Hooker’s theology allowed little in the way of immediate, sudden, or violent change.

In the fourth book of the *Lawes*, Hooker advanced a historical argument and maintained that the Church of England was *already* reformed. Bancroft’s work contained several passing statements that tended in this direction, particularly when he argued that the lawfulness of reformation was inseparable from monarchy, but Hooker, in his conceptual tug of war with his opponents, repeatedly described England’s reformation as an already-completed event. In this, he and the Admonitioners had two diametrically opposed approaches to the reformation: Hooker looked exclusively to the past, while his opponents looked exclusively to the future. This divergence allowed Hooker to construct a detailed heresiological argument: ‘there hath arisen a sect in England, which...seeketh to reforme even the French reformation, and purge out from thence also dregs of popery.’⁷²⁷ Hooker conceded the existence of ‘some Churches reformed before ours’,⁷²⁸ but like Bancroft he also argued that there were different ‘kinds of reformation’. One of these was ‘this moderate kind, which the Church of England hath taken’, but the other was ‘more extreme and rigorous’.⁷²⁹ In England, reformation was begun by Henry VIII and maintained by Edward VI; despite being almost wholly overthrown by Mary, ‘reformed religion’ was ‘rayased as it were by miracle from the dead’ when Elizabeth ascended the throne. Like the Admonitioners, who encouraged Parliament to look to recent events as a theater of God’s

⁷²⁵ FLE, I.3.1; vol. I, p. 63.

⁷²⁶ Ibid., I.16.8; vol. I, p. 142.

⁷²⁷ Ibid., IV.8.4; vol. 1, p. 301.

⁷²⁸ Ibid., IV.13; vol. 1, p. 327.

⁷²⁹ Ibid., IV.14.6; vol. 1, pp. 342 – 3.

immanent involvement in the world, Hooker also appealed to history, proposing that in beholding the reign of Elizabeth, the Admonitioners unwittingly beheld a miracle. England's history was a drama of divine deliverance. Its witnesses were called to 'believe God himself',⁷³⁰ and thus abandon their desire to reform not only the 'French reformation', but England's as well.

According to Hooker, and entirely like Bancroft, reformation was not necessarily a good thing; it could even be heretical. The Admonitions attacked a number of English liturgical practices as 'popish', but in defending the Book of Common Prayer, Hooker argued that opposition to Rome, especially in the form of 'extreme dissimilitude',⁷³¹ was not an end in and of itself. Here too Hooker appealed to the past, albeit that of the early church, which he now drafted into his defense of the liturgy. Patristic theology and its definitions of orthodoxy and heresy became an effective way of dividing between orthodox and heretical reformations. In a section of the *Lawes* entitled 'That the example of the eldest Churches is not herein against us', Hooker discussed the third-century church father Tertullian, who joined the Montanists, a charismatic movement that the wider church condemned as heretical. Drawing a line of connection between the Montanists and 'them that favour this pretended reformation', Hooker complained that just as Tertullian rejected the consensus of the wider church, those who rejected the approved ceremonies of the Church of England situated themselves against the consensus of their own church. This was the first of several instances where Hooker argued that the Puritans were guilty of heresy by imitation. Slightly later, he drew another line of connection, but this time between Arianism and the 'reformed Churches of Poland', which had so repudiated Roman Catholicism that they had also rejected the doctrine of the Trinity as 'part of Antichristian corruption'.⁷³² Through their shared call for 'reformation' against all things Roman Catholic, Puritans were, at

⁷³⁰ Ibid., IV.14.7; vol. 1, pp. 343 – 4.

⁷³¹ Ibid., IV.8.1; vol. 1, p. 298.

⁷³² Ibid., IV.8.2; vol. 1, p. 299.

least potentially, guilty by association. Hooker elaborated upon this in the fifth book, when he addressed the Admonitioners' rejection of the Athanasian Creed. In no uncertain terms, Hooker declared that the 'blasphemies of Arrians' had been 'renued' by those who embraced 'the course of extreame reformation'.⁷³³ Already suspected of a metaphysical affront through their rejection of the law, and also in danger of denying divine deliverance, Puritans were now identified as committing the ultimate theological outrage: denying Christ himself. In Hooker's hands, heresiology propelled a series of attacks upon practically every facet of the Admonitioners' call for reformation. Hooker was no different than Whitgift and Bancroft, and they were no different than their critics, whether Catholic or Puritan. Heresiology and history were the orders of the day.

⁷³³ Ibid., V.42.13; vol. 2, p. 177; see Field and Wilcox, et. al., *An Admonition to the Parliament*, p. 57, where they reject saying the Athanasian Creed.

Chapter Four

Angel or Devil:

Royal Reformation and its Opponents

‘For I have observed that the Devil of Rebellion, doth commonly turn himself into an Angel of Reformation; and the old Serpent can pretend new Lights: When some men’s Consciences accuse them for Sedition and Faction, they stop its mouth with the name and noise of Religion; when Piety pleads for peace and patience, they cry out Zeal.’

- King Charles I, *Eikon Basilike*, §27⁷³⁴

I.

In April 1603, as King James VI of Scotland made his way south to London, he was presented with a written request for reformation. The authors and supporters of this supplication were optimistic about their ability to secure their desired end; the Scottish king had not yet reached his new English capital, much less been crowned as James I of England. Originally entitled ‘The Humble Petition’, it is now more widely known as ‘The Millenary Petition’ because of its claim to represent ‘more then a thousand’ of the king’s subjects, including a number of ministers.⁷³⁵ The petition identified and ranked four matters for reformation: liturgical ceremonies, the requirements for ordination, the problem of pluralism, and the need for church discipline. This sequential order reveals significant continuity with the admonitions of the 1570s. In both documents, the rites contained within the Book of Common Prayer comprised the principal matter of offense. Assuring the king that they desired ‘not a disorderly innovation, but a due and godlie reformation’, the authors offered to present more detailed information either in

⁷³⁴ Charles I, *Eikon Basilike*, edited by Jim Daems and Holly Faith Nelson (Broadview Editions, 2006), p. 186.

⁷³⁵ ‘The Humble Petition’ in The University of Oxford, *The Answere of...the Universitie of Oxford* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19011), p. 2. A slightly modernized version may be found as ‘The Millenary Petition, 1603’ in J. P. Kenyon (ed.), *The Stuart Constitution 1603 – 1688: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 132 – 4. For a brief overview of historiography, see ‘Millenary Petition’ in F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, third ed. (revised) (Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 1094.

writing or ‘by conference among the learned’.⁷³⁶ The king chose the latter course and in January 1604 called a conference at Hampton Court.

Before this meeting took place, the heads of the University of Oxford published a pointed response to the Humble Petition. *The Answer of the... Universitie of Oxford* proclaimed on its cover page that its conclusions were ‘Agreeable, undoubtedly, to the ioint and Vniforme opinion, of all the Deanes and Chapters, and all other the learned and obedient Cleargy, in the Church of England’. Its Epistle Dedicatory described the Humble Petition as a ‘libell’ intended to ‘deprauē and slaunder, not only the Communion booke, but the whole estate of the Church, as it standes reformed by our late Soveraigne’.⁷³⁷ The petition’s authors were decried as both ‘factious Schismatikes’ and ‘factious Puritaines’. The University also denied the petition’s claim to represent ‘more than a thousand’, countering that the petitioners had willfully and dishonestly chosen to ‘pretend a number’.⁷³⁸ Whether intentionally or not, Oxford’s *Answer* drew together the same concerns expressed in the 1590s by those such as Richard Bancroft and Richard Hooker. With Bancroft and Hooker, the Oxford heads articulated a consistent sense of misgiving. At the beginning of their *Answer*, the Millenary Petition’s call for ‘reformation’ was derided as ‘their desired Reformation, vnjustly so called’;⁷³⁹ at the end, it was described as a ‘Conspiracy for pretended Reformation’.⁷⁴⁰ Like Bancroft’s *Dangerous Positions*, the *Answer* underscored the violence and disorder then present in Scotland. Perhaps due to the new king’s Scottish background and the popularity of his own publications, the Oxford heads referenced James VI’s political work *Basilikon Doron* as evidence in support of their claim.⁷⁴¹ By appealing to the new

⁷³⁶ ‘The Humble Petition’, in The University of Oxford, *The Answer of...the Universitie of Oxford*, pp. 5, 4.

⁷³⁷ Ibid., ¶3v.

⁷³⁸ Ibid., this would be ¶4, if following on from the previous page..

⁷³⁹ Ibid., p. 7

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 27.

⁷⁴¹ Ibid., p. 9.

king's own experience in Scotland, they drew a line of connection between the English petitioners and James VI's Scottish enemies.⁷⁴² Like Hooker's *Lawes*, the *Answers* defended the Book of Common Prayer, raising the spectre of heresy by arguing that some of those who rejected the Prayer Book also advanced a 'pestilent and blasphemous' theology.⁷⁴³ The university alleged that its opponents were impious, and that Christmas and other holy days had suffered 'intollerable prophanation' by Puritans.⁷⁴⁴ The University of Cambridge concurred and soon endorsed the Oxford response.⁷⁴⁵ By late 1603, the impending conference between the king and the petitioners had become a national matter of both ecclesial and academic interest and concern.

Our knowledge of the Hampton Court Conference comes primarily from William Barlow, whose small volume *The Symme and Svbstance of the Conference* records the debates that took place between the king, his counselors, and the petitioners. The work is not a transcript but, in Barlow's words, 'an Extract, wherein is the Substance of the whole'.⁷⁴⁶ The importance of Barlow's 'extract' was recognized at the time and earned the approval of James VI and I.⁷⁴⁷ It was the largest and most detailed account of the Hampton Court Conference written by a participant.⁷⁴⁸ The *Symme and Svbstance of the Conference* followed familiar lines of argumentation by raising questions about sedition and heresy on the part of the petitioners. These accusations had already been made by Richard Bancroft, then bishop of London and one of the

⁷⁴² Ibid., pp. 20, 29.

⁷⁴³ Ibid., p. 12.

⁷⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

⁷⁴⁵ Patrick Collinson, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference', in Howard Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War: Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government* (Macmillan Press, 1983), pp. 27 – 51, here pp. 30 – 1, 188 n. 11.

⁷⁴⁶ William Barlow, *The Symme and Svbstance of the Conference* (London, 1604; STC 1456.5), sig. A3.

⁷⁴⁷ Frederick Shriver, 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (January 1982), pp. 48 – 71, here p. 64.

⁷⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 64 – 6; Collinson, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement', p. 37. Helpful comments on the historiography of the Hampton Court Conference can be found in W. B. Patterson, *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 43 – 8.

participants at the Hampton Court Conference, but if Barlow's portrayal is correct, in 1604 such concerns were most consistently voiced by James VI and I. The king alleged that the petitioners' complaints were 'pretended' and he labeled the petitioners themselves as 'headstrong'. He further connected their call for reformation with rebellion, and he argued that the petitioners could use their theological arguments to ultimately reject the doctrine of the Trinity.⁷⁴⁹ Barlow's treatise was therefore much more than a partial record or transcription; it was, above all, a display of James' own theological erudition and orthodoxy. Those in attendance repeatedly praised the king's decisions, and their declarations supported his proactive use of the royal supremacy. The most effusive example of this came from the Dean of Chester, who enthused, 'I have often hearde and read, that *Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote* [the *persona* of the king is mixed with that of the priest], but I never saw the truth thereof, till this day.'⁷⁵⁰ Such acclaim placed the king's opponents in a comparatively negative light, and by the end of the conference James had emerged as an enemy to both Puritans and their reformation.

Barlow divided his work into three sections, each of which contained a discussion from one day of the conference. Of these, the first and second were the more detailed. The report on the third day was brief, specifying the doctrinal norms of the Church of England and concluding with the defeated petitioners vowing 'to bee quiet and obedient'.⁷⁵¹ The first day's debates centered on episcopal confirmation, priestly absolution, the private administration of baptism by midwives, and excommunication. The king defended the first and second matters as they were then practiced,⁷⁵² but he offered a minor concession on the fourth point by redefining

⁷⁴⁹ Barlow, *The Symme and Svbstance of the Conference*, pp. 66, 81 – 2, and 73.

⁷⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 84. Translation mine.

⁷⁵¹ Ibid., p. 103.

⁷⁵² Ibid., pp. 10 – 13.

excommunication to exclude lesser forms of censure.⁷⁵³ Private baptism occasioned a considerable amount of deliberation, but it also provided the king an opportunity to discourse on ‘the necessitie of baptism’, a matter that he had defended decades earlier against those Scottish ministers who ascribed ‘too litle to that holy Sacrament.’⁷⁵⁴ In a rare instance of agreement with the Scottish Confession of 1580, James was unwilling to concede that unbaptized infants were damned,⁷⁵⁵ but he also stated his opinion that ministers who refused to baptize would be consigned to hell. In the end, the king restricted baptism to ordained ministers and therefore altered Elizabethan practice,⁷⁵⁶ but this too was a comparatively minor concession. Having highlighted the king’s opposition to those Scottish ministers whose practices were most dissimilar from the English church, Barlow concluded this portion of his work with praise, enthusing that during the conference at Hampton Court, the king had fulfilled the words of Christ. Despite growing up among Scots Presbyterians, James had not adopted their theology; thus, ‘as the Saviour of the world said, *Though he lived among them, he was not of them.*’⁷⁵⁷ James may not have been the light of the world, but for Barlow and many others, he was certainly the brightest light on England’s ecclesial horizon.

Barlow’s report on the second day’s conference is the longest section of the *Symme and Svbsstance*. Although much of the material in these pages concerned matters of ritual, this portion of the narrative also focused upon distinctly doctrinal matters such as predestination, the need for a new translation of the Bible, and the canon of Scripture.⁷⁵⁸ All of these topics touched in some

⁷⁵³ Ibid., p. 19.

⁷⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 16 – 17.

⁷⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 17; for the relevant portion from the Scottish Confession of 1580, see Schaff, vol. III, p. 482.

⁷⁵⁶ The change proved permanent and was retained in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. See David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 121 – 3.

⁷⁵⁷ Barlow, *The Symme and Svbsstance of the Conference*, p. 20. This seems to be an allusion to John 1:10 – 11.

⁷⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 63 – 70 (ritual), 28 – 30 and 38 – 43 (predestination), 45 – 8 (a new translation), 59 – 63 (canon of Scripture).

way upon the most foundational of issues: authority in the English church. James remains well known for his statement ‘No bishop, no king’, an aphorism used twice in Barlow’s work, but its meaning was elaborated only in a larger discussion on ecclesial order and episcopal hierarchy.⁷⁵⁹ As part of their arguments against reformation, both Bancroft and the University of Oxford had pointed to events in Scotland, and on the second day of the conference James did the same. Drawing upon his own experience, the king rejected the petitioners’ request to limit the authority of bishops.⁷⁶⁰ James saw this request as an attempt to impose Presbyterianism on England, which in his words, ‘as well agreeth with a Monarchy, as God, and the Divell.’⁷⁶¹ Although the Puritan representatives protested their adherence to the royal supremacy, James suspected the contrary. He pointed out that John Knox and his associates had opposed the Scottish bishops despite declaring their adherence to the Scottish monarchy. In a telling phrase, James explained that when the Brethren later saw fit, they ventured ‘to vndertake the matters of *Reformation* themselves’. Their actions undermined the royal authority of James’ mother, Mary queen of Scots, and thereby indicated that their earlier protestations of loyalty had been insincere.⁷⁶² James’ approach to the English petitioners was animated by autobiographical reminiscence: ‘How they vsed that poore Lady my mother, is not unknown, and with grieve I may remember it’.⁷⁶³ This was not a new concern for the king, who had written against the same treatment nearly a decade earlier in *Basilicon Doron*,⁷⁶⁴ and James was unwilling to allow his Scottish experiences to be repeated in England. As he told the bishops at Hampton Court, ‘But if once you were out, and they in place, I knowe what would become of my *Supremacie*. No Bishop, no

⁷⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 36, 82.

⁷⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 78 – 9.

⁷⁶¹ Ibid., p. 79.

⁷⁶² Ibid., p. 81.

⁷⁶³ Ibid.

⁷⁶⁴ James VI and I, *Basilicon Doron*, in Johann P. Sommerville (ed.), *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1 – 61, here pp. 25 – 7.

King, as before I sayd.⁷⁶⁵ English fears of Scottish anarchy were vindicated by a Scottish monarch whose own experience in his native land made him determined to keep such mayhem at bay.

All of this resulted in a firm restatement of royal reformation. Oxford's *Answer* had argued that Puritans were enemies of 'the whole estate of the Church, as it standes reformed by our late Sovereigne'. Regrettably for the present investigation, the authors of the *Answer* did not detail the specifics of Elizabethan ecclesial reform, but William Barlow similarly noted several comments made by James VI and I about the religious developments of the sixteenth century. In his opening comments on the first day of the Hampton Court Conference, the king set forth his understanding of the royal supremacy, explaining that he called the Conference by 'no nouell devise, but according to the example of all Christian Princes, who, in the commencement of their raigne, usually take the first course for the establishing of the Church, both for doctrine and policie'.⁷⁶⁶ James appealed to Tudor history for multiple precedents, noting that 'in this land King *Henry* the eight, toward the ende of his raigne; after him King *Edward* the 6. who altered more, after him Queene *Marie*, who reuersed all; and the last Queene of famous memory...who settled it as now it standeth'.⁷⁶⁷ In a far briefer passing aside, on the second day of the conference James described Edward VI as having 'restored' religion, which was then 'ouerthrowne' by Mary.⁷⁶⁸ This was not unlike *Basilicon Doron*, which contained a passing comparison between 'the reformation of Religion in *Scotland*' and that in 'our neighbor countrey of *England*, as likewise in *Denmarke*, and sundry parts of *Germanie*'.⁷⁶⁹ Regrettably, like the Oxford heads, James never explained what he meant by 'reformation'. He instead elaborated on the fact that

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 82.

⁷⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 3.

⁷⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 3 – 4.

⁷⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 80.

⁷⁶⁹ James VI and I, *Basilicon Doron*, pp. 25 – 6.

unlike in Scotland, ‘reformation’ occurred in the latter three countries under the command of princes.

At the Hampton Court Conference, the king and his supporters were concerned with the maintenance of royal and thus lawful authority. As indicated by his *bon mot* ‘No Bishop, no King’, the royal supremacy was of vital importance to James, and when he described the ecclesiastical policy of Henry VIII and his children, the first and most important point was the simple fact that these Tudor monarchs took the lead in ecclesiastical matters. This was true even of Mary, who was otherwise decidedly outside of James’ theological sympathies. The king described England as ‘the promised land, where Religion was purely professed’. This contrasted with Scotland, where James had been ‘a King without state, without honor, without order’.⁷⁷⁰ His subsequent descriptions of an Edwardian restoration and an Elizabethan settlement were subservient to a more fundamental concern with royal headship of both church and state. The doctrinal content of reformation was less worthy of elaboration than royal oversight thereof.

Important developments followed the Hampton Court Conference. The first hearkened back to the morning of the third day’s conference, when the king and the bishops agreed on three ‘articles’ that all clergy should subscribe to: the royal supremacy, the Articles of Religion, and the Book of Common Prayer.⁷⁷¹ All three were central to the new ecclesiastical canons authorized by the Church of England in 1604. The opening section, entitled ‘Of the Church of England’, contained twelve canons. The first affirmed the royal supremacy and the second censured those who rejected it, prescribing excommunication as the appropriate punishment: ‘let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but onely by the Archbishop after his

⁷⁷⁰ Barlow, *The Symme and Sybstance of the Conference*, p. 4.

⁷⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 90 – 1.

repentance and public reuocation of those his wicked errors.’⁷⁷² The following ten canons dealt with the apostolic doctrine of the English church (Canon III), the Articles of Religion (Canon V), the Book of Common Prayer (Canons IV and VI), the episcopal structure of the church and holy orders (Canons VII and VIII), and schism (Canons IX – XII). Each canon ended with the same anathema set forth at the end of Canon II. Of these twelve canons, fully half enacted the three ‘articles’ that James and the bishops had agreed earlier. The rest of the canons contained further stipulations and guidelines for matters ranging from liturgical practice and sacramental participation to the requirements for preaching and other pastoral duties. The canons concluded with the king’s own ratification, which required every parish to purchase a copy by Christmas of that year. By late 1604, nonconformity was to be canonically deprived of any foothold.

After the new canons were passed, perhaps as many as 100 nonconforming ministers were removed from office.⁷⁷³ Although less than the hundreds removed by Archbishop Whitgift during Elizabeth’s reign,⁷⁷⁴ such a number hardly indicates that the king sought a pliable ecclesiastical policy.⁷⁷⁵ Some recent scholarship has divided between ‘radical’ and ‘moderate’ Puritans, and some historians have used this distinction to argue that James sought to encompass moderates,⁷⁷⁶ but no one in the seventeenth century operated with such a division. Barlow reports that some of his contemporaries preferred the rather more blunt dichotomy of ‘Conformitans’

⁷⁷² The Church of England, *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical* (London, 1604; STC 10070), Canon II.

⁷⁷³ Collinson, ‘The Jacobean Religious Settlement’, p. 45; Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, ‘The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I’, *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2 (Apr. 1985), pp. 169 – 207, p. 177, estimate 90.

⁷⁷⁴ For the remarkable range of estimates (between 200 and 2,000), see Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530 – 1700* (Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 56 n. 7; Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus*, p. 109, counts 300 – 400 in the diocese of Canterbury alone.

⁷⁷⁵ See Shriver, ‘Hampton Court Re-visited’, p. 66 – 9, for a general overview of the early years of the reign.

⁷⁷⁶ See Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, esp. pp. 55 – 76 for a definition of ‘moderate’ Puritanism; Fincham and Lake, ‘The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I’, pp. 179 – 82, argues that James sought to encompass ‘moderates’.

and ‘Puritanes’.⁷⁷⁷ The king also emphasized conformity, and at the Hampton Court Conference stated, ‘I will have one Doctrine and one discipline, one Religion in substance, and in ceremonie’.⁷⁷⁸ After 1604, the royal supremacy worked in tandem with newly ratified canonical norms to effect dozens of deprivations.

The last major development was the publication of the Authorized Version of the Bible. James had promised this in 1604; it was completed and published in 1611. As with other issues discussed at Hampton Court, debates surrounding the English Bible originated in Elizabeth’s reign. In 1560, a group of English translators led by William Whittingham produced the Geneva Bible.⁷⁷⁹ Whittingham was a colleague and émigré with John Ponet. Although based upon some of the best scholarship of the day, Whittingham did more than simply translate the Greek and Hebrew texts. The cover indicated that the translation contained ‘moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places’, thereby enabling readers to better understand the text. Other study aids, including maps and illustrations, were also included. But as with other sixteenth-century translations, the Geneva Bible was as much a product of prescriptive theology as it was the result of careful philology. The initial response of Elizabeth’s bishops to the translation was negative, and despite attaining some popularity, the Geneva Bible was never endorsed by the Church of England. Concern centered on the political claims made in the annotations, which frequently translated ‘king’ as ‘tyrant’ and also endorsed resistance theory against heads of state who failed in their religious duties.⁷⁸⁰ Such convictions were well outside the acceptable bounds of Elizabethan orthodoxy, and when Bible translation was discussed at Hampton Court, James did

⁷⁷⁷ Barlow, *The Symme and Svbstance of the Conference*, sig. Pv.

⁷⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 71.

⁷⁷⁹ Alister McGrath, *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture* (Anchor Books, 2001), pp. 114 – 23.

⁷⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 141 – 8.

not hesitate to describe the Geneva Bible as ‘the worst’ translation then available.⁷⁸¹ The king stipulated that in the new translation, ‘no marginall notes should be added, hauing found in them, which are annexed to the *Geneva* translation...some notes very partiall, vntrue, seditious, and savouring too much, of daungerous, and trayterous conceites’.⁷⁸² When the Authorized Version appeared in 1611, it followed through on the king’s concerns. It contained neither an editorial apparatus nor substituted the word ‘king’ with the word ‘tyrant’.⁷⁸³ Its prefatory material consisted solely of an introductory epistle, ‘The Translators to the Reader’, and a brief dedication to the king. The former emphasized the importance of royal care for the church and the latter concluded with a prayer for James’ continued prosperity. The Geneva Bible and the Authorized Version shared little common political ground. In 1614, the crown began to strongly discourage the printing of the Geneva Bible,⁷⁸⁴ and its last legally printed edition appeared two years later.⁷⁸⁵ Between 1604 and 1611, a Jacobean ‘settlement’ of the church came about through the imposition of an uncompromising orthodoxy.

II.

The Hampton Court Conference brought about a noticeable decline in calls for reformation, which did not reemerge with force until the late 1620s, after Charles I took the throne. This apparent decline in interest was paralleled by dictionary entries; insofar as general use dictionaries indicate the relevance of a word to a literate population, it is of considerable import that ‘reformation’ was not among the headwords used by the authors and compilers of the first Jacobean dictionaries. They took notice of neither ‘reformation’ nor its cognates. Robert

⁷⁸¹ Barlow, *The Symme and Svbstance of the Conference*, p. 46.

⁷⁸² Ibid., pp. 46 – 7.

⁷⁸³ McGrath, *In the Beginning*, p. 143.

⁷⁸⁴ Gordon Campbell, *Bible: The Story of the King James Bible* (Oxford University Press, 2010), 113 – 14.

⁷⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 108.

Cawdry's *A Table Alphabeticall*, the first monolingual English dictionary, appeared in 1604 without an entry for 'reformation' or even 'reform'. The second edition of 1609, which was revised and expanded by Cawdry's son Thomas,⁷⁸⁶ contained the barest of entries for 'reforme', which was defined simply as 'amend'.⁷⁸⁷ This definition was left untouched in the later editions of 1613 and 1617. John Rider's bilingual Latin-English dictionary, which was first published in 1589 as *Bibliotheca Scholastica*, was expanded only in its third edition of 1612 to contain entries for 'reformatio', 'reformatio', 'reformatio', 'reformatio', and 'reformatio, a, um'.⁷⁸⁸ 'Reformatio' was defined as 'A renuing' and 'reformatio' as 'To renew, to reforme, to bring to the olde state again'. 'Reformatio' and 'reformatio' were the male and female nouns used of those who brought about such renewal,⁷⁸⁹ while 'reformatio, a, um' was the Latin adjective applied to that which had been reformed. Rider's focus upon reform as a return to the past may have a parallel in his one theological tractate, *A Friendly Caveat to Irelands Catholikes*, which rehearsed patristic understandings of the Eucharist against the Roman Catholic belief in transubstantiation. Although Rider did not discuss reformation in his *Caveat*, he did exhort his Catholic audience to 'reforme your iudgement' according to the apostolic and patristic standard of the early Church.

790

Even if 'reformation' was not among the most important of early seventeenth-century lemmata, once entered into a dictionary its definition was consonant with sixteenth-century lemmata. In his definition of 'reformatio', Rider largely copied Thomas Thomas' 1587 *Dictionarium*

⁷⁸⁶ Janet Batley, 'Cawdrey, Robert (b. 1537/8?, d. in or after 1604)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/69578>, accessed 27 June 2014].

⁷⁸⁷ Robert Cawdry, *A Table Alphabeticall* (London, 1609; STC 4884.5), sig. H3v.

⁷⁸⁸ John Rider and Francis Holyoake, *Riders Dictionarie Corrected* (London, 1612; STC 21033), no pag.

⁷⁸⁹ Rider, however, describes 'reformatio' and 'reformatio' as verbs, not nouns. This remained true even in the 1659 edition of his work.

⁷⁹⁰ John Rider, *A Friendly Caveat to Irelands Catholikes* (Dublin, 1602; STC 21031), no pag. If following along from sig. S3, this would be sig. S4.

Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae. Thomas partially defined ‘reformatio’ as ‘To reforme, to renewe, to bring to the old state againe’.⁷⁹¹ Rider borrowed this entirely, and in following Thomas he also followed Thomas Cooper, whose 1565 definition of ‘reformatio’, discussed in the previous chapter, was taken directly into Thomas’ own dictionary. Rider died in 1632, but his dictionary continued to be revised and republished through 1659. The last edition of his work also listed the same five Latin entries that were added in 1612. The only changes were the inclusion of relevant Greek words and the addition of ‘to transform’ at the end of the definition for ‘reformatio’. The same consistency can be found in other popular bilingual dictionaries, such as Randle Cotgrave’s *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (1611), and John Florio’s *Queen Anna’s New World of Words, Or Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues* (1612), a revised version of his 1598 dictionary *A Worlde of Wordes*. Both dictionaries noted cognates between their respective languages but only one entry carried a religiously themed definition; Cotgrave defined ‘reformez’ as ‘Reformists, an Order of Franciscan Fryers’.⁷⁹² These dictionaries were both revised and republished into the last quarter of the seventeenth century, and the definitions for these headwords remained unchanged. Once included in a dictionary, words such as ‘reform’ and ‘reformation’ were not sites for semantic confusion but semantic stability, and were rarely used in dictionaries to describe, much less define, contemporary religious matters.

There is one notable exception: Thomas Wilson’s *A Christian Dictionary*, which first appeared in 1612. A revised version followed in 1616 that was frequently republished, reaching no less than seven further editions by the time that the last edition was printed in 1678. The 1612 title page of *A Christian Dictionary* advertised it as ‘Opening the signification of the chiefe words dispersed generally through Holie Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, tending to

⁷⁹¹ Thomas Thomas, *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (London, 1587; STC 24008), no pag.

⁷⁹² Randle Cotgrave, *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (London, 1611; STC 5830).

increase Christian knowledge'.⁷⁹³ One of these 'chiefe words' was 'reformation', which Wilson defined as 'Framing againe, or bringing backe, of persons and thinges disordered and out of course, vnto their first forme and state wherein they were set, eyther by Gods Creation, or institution and ordinance. Psal. 50, 17. *Seeing thou hatest to be Reformed.* Hebr. 9, 10. *Untill the time of Reformation.*'⁷⁹⁴ The definition itself was nothing out of the ordinary, but Wilson's Biblical examples raise some important interpretive questions. The quotation from Hebrews 9 is found in both the Authorized Version and the Geneva Bible, but the partial citation of Psalm 50 was found only in the latter. Was Wilson implying a larger theological argument than his seemingly benign definition suggests?

If Wilson's use of the Geneva Bible is used to contextualize his understanding of Hebrews 9:10, then he may have sought to invoke the Geneva Bible's argument against liturgical ceremonies. The Geneva Bible introduced Hebrews 9 by summarizing its contents with a twofold argument. 'How that the Ceremonies and sacrifices of the Lawe are abolished. By the eternity and perfection of Christs sacrifice.'⁷⁹⁵ The Geneva Bible's translation of Hebrews 9:10 says that the ceremonies of ancient Israel 'onely stode in meats and drinkes, and diuers washings, and carnal rites, vntil the time of Reformation.' An explanatory note appended to the phrase 'carnal rites' reads, 'Which ceremonies althogh they were ordeined of God, yet considered in them selues, or els compared with Christ, are but carnal, grosse, and earthlie & touche not the soule.'⁷⁹⁶ Given that the Admonitions of the early 1570s drew a direct line of connection between Jewish rites and the Book of Common Prayer, and given that this same polemic was

⁷⁹³ Thomas Wilson, *A Christian Dictionary* (London, 1612; STC 25786).

⁷⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 394.

⁷⁹⁵ The Geneva Bible (Geneva, 1560; STC 2093), The New Testament, fol. 104. The numeration is not consistent from the beginning to the end of the translation; each new section of the Geneva Bible begins a new series of numbers.

⁷⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, fol. 104v.

part of the Millenary Petition, one could plausibly read Wilson's dictionary as maintaining this same series of arguments.

It is possible, however, that Wilson's use of the Geneva Bible reflected only a general influence, rather than a specific qualm on his part about ceremonies. In the second edition of *A Christian Dictionary*, he expanded his definition of 'Reformation' by appending a further explanation immediately after his concluding citation of Hebrews 9:10:

This time of Reformation (or correction) is the time when Legal ceremonies & shadowes were to cease and fade; it took the beginning vpon Christ his first shewing himselfe in the flesh, and had further progresse by his death and resurrection, but through-perfection when he ascended to heauen, which was the consummation of the Old Testament, and the full initiation of the New.⁷⁹⁷

Wilson's reference to 'Legal ceremonies & shadowes' is important. It dovetails more closely with the translation of Hebrews 9:10 found in the Authorized Version, which uses 'carnal ordinances' in place of the Geneva Bible's phrase 'carnal rites'. The former is a more literal translation of the original Greek, which reads δικαιώματα σαρκός. Despite its meaning being wholly effaced in the Geneva Bible, δικαιώματα (pl.; sg., δικαίωμα) refers not to ceremonies but to legal obligations imposed upon those judged guilty in a court of law. By way of ἀδίκημα, which denotes an intentional wrong, δικαίωμα is etymologically related to δίκη, the Greek word for justice. The translation of Hebrews 9:10 found in both the Geneva Bible and the Authorized Version concludes with the same phrase, 'until the time of Reformation'—but by translating the immediately preceding clause differently, the meaning of 'Reformation' ultimately differs as well. The Authorized Version contained not even an implicit argument against liturgical ceremonies, and given its refusal of theological commentary, its more literal translation further

⁷⁹⁷ Thomas Wilson, *A Christian Dictionary*, second edition (London, 1616; STC 25787), p. 476.

removed any potential opposition between the English liturgy and Christ's own act of 'Reformation'. All later editions of *A Christian Dictionary* retained the definition of 1616. When taken as a whole, Wilson's expanded definition was not concerned with ritual but with Christ's work as the beginning of the New Testament. One would have to read *A Christian Dictionary* side by side with the Geneva Bible in order to tease out any other possible connotations for 'reformation', but given royal suppression of the Geneva Bible from 1614 on, this would have been difficult.

III.

The last seven years of James' reign were heavily influenced by developments on the European continent. In 1618, an English delegation attended the Synod of Dort in the Netherlands. Dort sought to deal with two intertwined issues: the theology of Jacob Arminius, a Dutch pastor, and the relationship between the Dutch Netherlands and Spain, the dominant imperial power in Europe and the political backbone of Catholicism. The political facets of the debate over Arminianism must be emphasized; the last quarter of the twentieth century saw an immense amount of scholarship about English theological responses to Arminianism, but almost nothing about the larger political theatre in which these debates were staged. Almost immediately after the Synod of Dort ended, English critics of Arminianism began alleging that Arminius was a Spanish spy, and this led critics to associate Arminius with Catholicism later in the decade. Within England, this twin set of associations saw the sudden revival of much older debates about the ceremonial of the Book of Common Prayer. Under Charles I, English involvement at Dort would serve to reignite debates about the reformation of the Church of England.

Jacob Arminius was a Dutch pastor who began teaching theology at the University of Leiden in 1603. While there, he entered into an academic dispute with his colleague Francis Gomarus over the doctrine of predestination. Although both affirmed the standard scholastic distinction between election and reprobation, they disagreed over the means by which an individual Christian was made either elect or reprobate. The ensuing dispute has been described as a ‘pamphlet war’,⁷⁹⁸ and its violence is still commented upon.⁷⁹⁹ It came to involve debate over political issues as well, most notably the relationship between church and state in the Netherlands and the relationship between the Dutch Republic and the Spanish Empire.⁸⁰⁰ But before the Synod of Dort, the official theology of the Dutch church was fairly rudimentary; its doctrinal standards consisted of only the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. Both were composed in the mid-sixteenth century and thus before the rise of intense debate about predestination. Neither text contained an extended discussion on point. In its sixteenth article, the Belgic Confession merely affirmed the centuries-old distinction between elect and reprobate persons, and the Heidelberg Catechism simply confirmed the equally traditional view that the individual Christian was, like the wider Christian church, elect. As Arminius himself observed, ‘On this article of religion there is no consistent and uniform opinion among the teachers of our church.’⁸⁰¹ In 1608, Arminius and Gomarus were both asked by the States of Holland to compose an explanation of their respective views. Arminius’ response, *The Declaration of Sentiments*, became his last theological work, as he died the following year.

⁷⁹⁸ Stephen Gunter, *Arminius and His Declaration of Sentiments: An Annotated Translation with Introduction and Theological Commentary* (Baylor University Press, 2012), p. 191. All citations of Arminius’ *Declaration of Sentiments* will be taken from this edition.

⁷⁹⁹ Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477 – 1806* (Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 439

⁸⁰⁰ Arminius, *Declaration of Sentiments*, pp. 98 – 9; Anthony Milton (ed.), *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618 – 1619)* (Boydell, 2005), pp. xvii, xxii – xxiii.

⁸⁰¹ Arminius, *Declaration of Sentiments*, p. 103.

The *Declaration* was divided into three parts. The first recounted the recent history, both political and theological, that surrounded Arminius' debate with Gomarus. The concluding section briefly called for a national synod to revise both the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism in such a way that neither document could lead to further theological disputation. The middle portion contained the heart of the work. Arminius offered nineteen individual reasons for rejecting Gomarus' understanding of predestination. In the process, he touched upon a number of related and sometimes more foundational theological topics. Gomarus argued for what soon became known as 'supralapsarianism', which taught that before the fall of humanity, God elected particular persons for salvation and reprobated the rest for damnation.⁸⁰² This rendered their own actions irrelevant in light of the divine decree. Although predestination was the presenting issue, Arminius believed that the doctrine of God was ultimately at stake. After six points which denied that supralapsarianism was taught in the Bible, the early Church, or in other reformed churches, the seventh point encapsulated Arminius' core argument, that supralapsarianism was 'repugnant to the goodness of God.'⁸⁰³ From this, Arminius deduced several corollaries that became standard fodder in later rounds of this theological debate. One was that supralapsarianism, because it paid no attention to human works, actually made the fall of humanity the result of divine necessity and thus divine coercion. Arminius countered that if an act is coerced, the actor cannot be held fully responsible for his or her deeds.⁸⁰⁴ Supralapsarianism thus inverted the moral order, and Arminius believed that it would subvert the social order, too. He alleged that the adherents of supralapsarianism would become indifferent to

⁸⁰² Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 106 – 40. The doctrine was in use in England by the late 1620s. The Oxford English Dictionary (third edition, 2012) records 'surpralapsarian' being used by the early 1630s.

⁸⁰³ Arminius, *Declaration of Sentiments*, Section Two, VII, n. 3 (p. 114).

⁸⁰⁴ Ibid., Section Two, e.g., VIII, nn. 1 – 2 (pp. 115 – 16), XIV n. 2 (p. 119).

sin, good works, and prayer;⁸⁰⁵ their doctrine could lead to a ‘slothful and negligent’ ministry among the ordained, and it that would lead to despair among the wider populace.⁸⁰⁶ Because Arminius desired a close relationship between the Dutch church and the Dutch state, problems in the former would eventually become problems in the latter. Gomarus’ doctrine was a threat to both.

In 1610, Arminius’ followers published the *Remonstrantia*, five articles that contested supralapsarian doctrine.⁸⁰⁷ Because of its title, Arminius’ supporters were soon known as Remonstrants, and their opponents as Counter-Remonstrants. Importantly, early English references to Arminianism referred to these five articles, but neither to Arminius’ *Declaration* nor to any of his other works. A good example of this is found in a speech given in 1617 by Dudley Carleton, an English diplomat at the Hague. Carleton revealed no detailed knowledge of Arminius’ theology or writings, despite blaming him as the sole origin of religious conflict in Netherlands.⁸⁰⁸ The English diplomat said only that Arminius and others had ‘the same troubles in their consciences vpon those high points of Predestination’. The problem appeared—at least from Carleton’s perspective—to have been social rather than doctrinal, and he believed that until Arminius, the Dutch church had enjoyed ‘peace and quiet’.⁸⁰⁹ Perhaps this description was offered as a rhetorical overstatement, but this same overestimation of a prior Dutch harmony can also be found in Carleton’s diplomatic letters.⁸¹⁰ Later in the same speech, he described the Remonstrants as socially subversive because they bred unrest ‘vnder coulour of fiue pointes

⁸⁰⁵ Ibid., Section Two, XVI nn. 2 – 4 (p. 121).

⁸⁰⁶ Ibid., Section Two, XVIII n. 5 (p. 124), XVI n. 6 (p. 122).

⁸⁰⁷ Text in Schaff, Vol. III, pp. 545 – 9.

⁸⁰⁸ Dudley Carleton, *The Speech of Sir Dvdly Carlton* (London, 1618; STC 4629), pp. 2 – 3.

⁸⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁸¹⁰ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, p. 435.

(which haue not as yet passed a lawfull examination)'.⁸¹¹ But here too Carleton indicated no knowledge of the doctrinal content of the *Remonstrantia*.

Because of continuing unrest, the Synod of Dort sought to resolve the fissiparous state of the Dutch church. The synod was itself preceded by sharp political discord. Several months before it began, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, the Advocate of the States of Holland and a Remonstrant, was arrested. Like other Remonstrants, Oldenbarnevelt advocated maintaining peace with Spain, and his political opponents largely came from territories where Counter-Remonstrant theology was dominant.⁸¹² The theological outcome of the Synod of Dort was shot through with political implications, and although it was largely concerned with the internal life of the Dutch republic, representatives from elsewhere in Europe, including England, were invited to attend. James VI and I responded positively to this invitation and sent a handpicked delegation. For the king of England, more was at stake than the current state of theological debate. W. B. Patterson argues that English participation at Dort was 'a significant part of his [James'] larger plan for religious and political pacification.'⁸¹³ One discovers precisely this in the oration made at Dort by the English delegate and bishop of Llandaff, George Carleton. Like the speech given the previous year by his cousin Dudley, bishop Carleton revealed no interest in doctrinal particulars. He instead stated that the king of England 'hath sent vs hither with this especial charge, that as much as in vs lyes, we procure your prosperity, and your Churches Peace.'⁸¹⁴ Near the end of his oration, Carleton explained that the English king 'commends vnto you the consent of the Churches'.⁸¹⁵ Theological speculation was to be rejected, because 'Your consent in Doctrine with other Churches, shall bee a sacrifice of sweet sauor vnto God', leading

⁸¹¹ Carleton, *The Speech of Sir Dvdly Carlton*, p. 4.

⁸¹² Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 458 – 60; Milton, *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*, p. xvii.

⁸¹³ Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, p. 261.

⁸¹⁴ George Carleton, *An Oration Made at the Hage* (London, 1619; STC 4638), p. 2.

⁸¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

ultimately to ‘the Churches Peace’.⁸¹⁶ The synod concluded by passing a series of canons. They rejected the Remonstrants’ five articles, claiming that they merely repeated the theology of the fifth-century heretic Pelagius, but the synod also failed to endorse supralapsarianism.⁸¹⁷ The canons struck a *via media* between the two positions and called for teachers to avoid ‘any curious searching into the ways of the most High’.⁸¹⁸ Nonetheless, and despite such conciliatory wording, political discord revived after the synod concluded. Oldenbarnevelt was among the first victims of a Counter-Remonstrant victory that Jonathan Israel describes as ‘The Calvinist Revolution’.⁸¹⁹ Most importantly for the wider European political theatre, the Counter-Remonstrant insurgency soon embroiled the Dutch republic in war with Spain.⁸²⁰

The political outcome of the Synod of Dort was diametrically opposed to the diplomatic and ecumenical vision of James VI and I,⁸²¹ and it conflicted with the king’s other major diplomatic effort. At precisely the same time that English delegates were in attendance at Dort, James attempted to secure a dynastic union between the Spanish and English crowns. These efforts were not always well received at home, and relations were especially cool between the king and the House of Commons. James believed that marriage might pave the way for both political peace and Christian reunion, but the lower house of Parliament was deeply hostile toward Catholicism.⁸²² When the possibility of a union between prince Charles and the Catholic princess of France had been floated in 1614, relations so broke down between King and

⁸¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 8, 9. Patterson comments on Carleton’s *Oration in King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, pp. 265 – 6.

⁸¹⁷ A point emphasized in Patterson, in *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, p. 276. The doctrine of Dort is the same as that of Peter Martyr Vermigli and ultimately Thomas Aquinas. See Peter Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, edited and translated by Frank A. James III (Truman State University Press, 2003), esp. pp. 19 – 25; ST 1a q. 23. Unlike James, I fail to see any substantive difference in the doctrine of reprobation between Aquinas and Vermigli.

⁸¹⁸ The Canons of Dort, I.XIV, in Milton (ed.), *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*, p. 300.

⁸¹⁹ Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, p. 450.

⁸²⁰ Ibid, p. 465.

⁸²¹ Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, p. 296; Israel; *The Dutch Republic*, p. 471.

⁸²² Glyn Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 27 – 38; Patterson, *Kings James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, pp. 314 – 38.

Commons that the entire Parliament was dissolved. In 1621, when Parliament was summoned for the first time in seven years, the same conflict reemerged but with renewed intensity and new international target: Spain.

In England, anti-Spanish literature in the 1620s was often saturated with anti-Remonstrant polemic. The most consistently vocal critic of the Spanish match was probably Thomas Scott, who authored the anonymous pamphlet *Vox Populi* in 1620 as well as a number of other works that addressed the same topic in the following years.⁸²³ The title page of *Vox Populi* claimed that it was ‘translated according to the Spanish coppie’, implying that its account of a conversation between the king of Spain and his counselors was based upon a Spanish transcript. In this pamphlet, Scott used the imperial ambitions of Spain to interpret the spiritual ambitions of the papacy.⁸²⁴ He portrayed Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, the count of Gondomar and the Spanish ambassador to England, as a principal conspirator who sought to subvert the English state. Not only was Gondomar supposedly stirring up political support among English Catholics, but he was also planning to buy up every single scholarly book in England so that the English would be deprived of both libraries and learning. Gondomar was even made to summarize his joint political and religious mission as ‘the advancement of the Spanish State and Romish Religion together.’⁸²⁵ Scott did more, however, than insinuate conspiracy on the part of the Spanish ambassador and English Catholics; he also portrayed the Dutch Remonstrant Johan van Oldenbarnevelt as an agent of Spain. At the very end of *Vox Populi*, Gondomar described Oldenbarnevelt as ‘our most trusty and able Pentioner’, lamenting that his arrest placed Spanish plans for the Netherlands in a state of suspension.⁸²⁶ This invention of a collusion between

⁸²³ Thomas Scott, *Vox Populi or Newes from Spayne* (London, 1620; STC 22098).

⁸²⁴ See *Ibid.*, e.g., sigs. A3r – v, and the unnumbered page that would be sig. A4.

⁸²⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. B.

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, no pag., but if following along from sig. D this would be sig. D2; see also sig. C2.

Oldenbarnevelt, the Spanish, and the papacy caught on quickly in England. The following year, in a speech made to the House of Commons, Edward Cecil described the Arminians as ‘a faction now a working’ for the Spanish, which aimed at both religious and political supremacy.⁸²⁷

Assertions of a malevolent political connection between Spain and the Dutch Remonstrants were made through the end of the 1620s,⁸²⁸ and war between Spain and the Netherlands shaped English discourse about both Catholicism and Arminianism for the next two decades.

IV.

The Luther centenary of 1617 reached England’s shores in 1618 as well. English interest was evidently underwhelming, and just one work was published on point: *The Dyke of Saxonie His Ivbilee*, a pamphlet comprised of two texts from the European continent. The English translator was an otherwise unnamed ‘worthy minister in our London Dutch church’,⁸²⁹ and the editor was also left unidentified. The first text was by Johann Georg I, the Prince Elector of Saxony. Dated 12 August 1617, the Prince Elector gave liturgical instructions for a series of feast days that celebrated Luther from 30 October through 2 November. The Eucharist was to be celebrated on each of the four feast days, as well as on 26 October, when the feast days were publicly announced; particular prayers and Scripture passages were also appointed for use between 31 October and 2 November. Johann Georg I called upon ministers to ‘admonish their hearers to consider how Almighty God by the said reformation hath giuen vnto them, the right vse of his most holy Testament, and hath deliuered his Church from the manifold abuses of the

⁸²⁷ Edward Cicill, *A Speech Made in the Lower Hovse of Parliament* (London, 1621; STC 22087), p. 2.

⁸²⁸ John Russell, *The Spy Discovering the Danger of Arminian Heresie and Spanish Trecherie* (Amsterdam, 1628; STC 20577); William Prynne, *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme* (London, 1629; STC 20457), esp. sig. c3v.

⁸²⁹ Anonymous, *The Dyke of Saxonie His Ivbilee* (London, 1618; STC 14656), sig. A2.

same.’⁸³⁰ And yet, even here it is not entirely clear that he equated Luther with a historical event termed *the* Reformation. At the end of his text, he called for theological faculty to engage ‘in exquisite Disputations and Orations, comprehending therein the description of former darknes, of the ensuing gracious Euangelicall light, and the great vtility of the present Reformation’.⁸³¹ The language is telling; *the* Reformation was present, not past.

The second text was *A Chronology of the Gospels Ivbilee*, an outline of Christian history from 1517 to 1610. Written ‘by students in Worms and printed at Heidelberge’, it revealed a Reformed confessional orientation.⁸³² The liturgical concerns of Johann Georg I were made possible by the Lutheran retention of ceremonies, but the *Chronology* celebrated iconoclasm, commented extensively on Huguenot history, and remained wholly mum about the 1577 Formula of Concord, which had done so much to permanently separate Protestantism into separate Lutheran and Reformed confessions. Tellingly, it also described 1529, when evangelical services were first held in Zurich, as ‘renowned for the reformation of many Churches’. For the casual reader, none of this may have mattered, but the *Chronology* set Luther within a confessional orbit whose stellar figures had sometimes been his own enemies. In some ways, this accurately reflected the origin of Luther jubilee, which was first proposed by Frederick V of the Palatinate, who held Reformed theological convictions.⁸³³ Nonetheless, *The Dyke of Saxonie His Ivbilee* set Johann Georg I’s liturgical directions next to a confessional historiography partially borne of opposition to feast days and other ceremonies retained in the churches of the *Invariata*.

If these two texts were at odds with one another, they were also at odds with the introduction of the work. For the student authors of the *Chronology*, 1517 was a watershed: ‘In

⁸³⁰ Ibid., p. 2.

⁸³¹ Ibid., p. 7.

⁸³² Ibid., no pag.; if following on from sig. A2, this would be sig. A3.

⁸³³ For the German background, see Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520 – 1620* (Baker Academic, 1999), pp. 127.

the yeare 1517. the first wound was inflicted vpon Antichrist, in a disputation at *Wittenberge* against Indulgences.⁸³⁴ The English editor did not hold the same high view of Luther's Ninety-Five Theses as his continental counterparts, but instead wrote in the introduction to the work that 'Now wee and all Gods people wheresoeuer, make up all but one body, the Church (which is Zion) the requickenning and recollecting of whose members was in part, by Luther effected'.⁸³⁵ The descriptor should be emphasized: 'in part'. Rather than granting any kind of primacy to Luther, the editor instead depended upon the historical vision of John Foxe, who had set Luther as one prophetic voice in a series of others, all of whom protested against the papacy. The editor claimed that this line of prophets did not end with Luther but continued directly into the present, and most recently included Marco Antonio de Dominis, the Archbishop of Spalato who left his archiepiscopal see and defected from Roman Catholicism, entering England and its episcopal church in 1616. Praising divine providence, the editor enthused that God 'raised *Wickleff* from their Schooles, *Iohn Husse* from their Pulpits, *Martin Luther* from their Cloysters, and now *Marke Antony* from their Archiepiscopall Chaire.'⁸³⁶ This historiography, with its repeated and continuing acts of providential intervention, could not portray Luther as inflicting 'the first wound' in an apocalyptic battle. As with both earlier and later English apologists, Luther was but one figure among others, past and present. Perhaps tellingly, nothing by Luther was printed in England in 1617 or the years immediately after. In 1624, a translation of select prayers and Biblical commentaries by Luther appeared under the title *Every-dayes Sacrifice*;⁸³⁷ it was the only collection of Luther's writings printed in the 1620s, and in 1629 it saw its second and last impression. *The Dyke of Saxonie His Ivbilee* was never reprinted. England saw no Luther jubilee.

⁸³⁴ Anonymous, *The Dyke of Saxonie His Ivbilee*, p. 8.

⁸³⁵ Ibid., sig. A2.

⁸³⁶ Ibid., no pag.; if following on from sig. A2, this would be sig. A4r – v.

⁸³⁷ W. R. S., *Every-dayes Sacrifice* (London, 1624; STC 6398).

Luther's importance did not become a topic of sustained debate in England until the mid 1620s, but it took a catalyst other than Luther to bring the German evangelical to the attention of English religious controversialists. That catalyst was the conversion of Mary Villiers, countess of Buckingham, to Catholicism in 1622. Her son George was the favorite of King James VI and I. This put her conversion perilously close to the center of political power and also came at a time when anti-Catholic feeling was on the increase in England due to international developments: the beginning of what became the Thirty Years war, and the failure of Charles I and George Villiers to secure a dynastic union with Spain. The Countess' conversion was the work of John Percy, better known as Fisher the Jesuit, an energetic English convert to Catholicism. Between 1605 and 1610, Fisher had been involved in a small controversy about Roman Catholicism and its relation to the Church of England. His apologetic *A Treatise of Faith*, published pseudonymously under the initials A.D. in 1605, attracted replies by the clergymen Anthony Wotton and John White. None of these texts proved popular or had long-term influence, although White's response, entitled *The Way to the True Church* (1608), saw a second impression in 1610. Only with the countess of Buckingham's conversion did Fisher become a figure of major importance, and on 27 June 1623, Fisher participated in a theological conference with Daniel Featley and Francis White, apologists for the Church of England.

Featley immediately published his account of the conference. It appeared in 1623 without authorial ascription as a short, twenty-eight page pamphlet entitled *The Fisher Caught in his Owne Net*. A much-expanded version of more than 500 pages was published in 1624 with the slightly different title of *The Romish Fisher Cayght and Held in his Owne Net*;⁸³⁸ in addition to an appendix that followed a republished version of the dialogue, the new edition contained a

⁸³⁸ Daniel Featley, *The Fisher Caught in his Owne Net* (London, 1623; STC 10732); idem., *The Romish Fisher Cayght and Held in his Owne Net* (London, 1624; STC 10738.3).

number of other apologetics directed against other Catholic interlocutors. According to Featley, the conference on 27 June primarily concerned the visibility of the Church. Fisher chose the topic, and in scholastic style, set forth two questions for dispute: ‘*Whether the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, and especially in the ages going before Luther: 2. And whether the names of such visible Protestants in all ages can be shewed and proued out of good Authors.*’⁸³⁹ Despite the request of M. Sweet, another Jesuit in attendance, that ‘all bitter speeches be forborne’,⁸⁴⁰ the conversation quickly devolved. Each side demanded that the other side offer a list of historical witnesses to its particular version of Christianity, and each side refused to offer its list until the other side first offered its own.⁸⁴¹ After several rounds back and forth, Featley averred that ‘*The Protestant Church was so visible, that the names of those who taught and beleueed the doctrine thereof, may be produced in the first hundred yeares, and second, and third, and fourth, & sic de caeteris.*’⁸⁴² Beginning with Christ and the apostles, he further offered names from the history of the pre-Constantinian Church: Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian.⁸⁴³ Featley refused to continue until Fisher offered his own set of names for the same time period, but Fisher refused and the conference dissolved.⁸⁴⁴

Despite the tedious acrimony that all of this indicates, two points are noteworthy. First, Featley and Fisher both agreed upon the inherently visible nature of the Church. Nothing in the conference justifies our own widespread contemporary assumptions that Protestants held the Church to be invisible, and in the Epistle Dedicatory from his expanded edition of 1624, Featley

⁸³⁹ Featley, *The Fisher Caught in his Owne Net*, p. 5.

⁸⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 7.

⁸⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 10, 13, 21.

⁸⁴² Ibid., p. 23; the Latin translates as ‘thus from the rest’.

⁸⁴³ Ibid., pp. 23 – 4.

⁸⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 24 – 5.

further emphasized the importance and value of apologetic treatises on the visible church.⁸⁴⁵ Second, Featley and Fisher worked with two different conceptions of the Christian past. By placing Luther as the historical pivot at the very beginning of the discussion, Fisher made contemporary Catholic heresiology the key for his side's historical demarcation. Featley, however, emphasized the early Church, '*especially in the first 600 yeares*'.⁸⁴⁶ In the 1624 edition, Featley further emphasized the point, alleging that Fisher 'would haue the *Opponents* begin first with the last age, and so ascend vpwards,' thus enabling Fisher to 'lurke in the darke and muddy age next before *Luther*', far from 'the cleerer streame of the first ages'.⁸⁴⁷ Theological dispute and historiographical disparity mutually reinforced one another. By beginning with the apostolic and post-apostolic Church, Featley's historiography moved in a direction counter to Fisher's. However semantically questionable it might seem today, Featley's attempt at redefining Protestantism without reference to Luther was, at the same time, an attempt at downplaying Luther's importance. This is clearly seen in one of the addenda to *The Romish Fisher Cavght and Held in his Owne Net*. In a discussion entitled 'Of the denomination *Protestant*', Featley argued that because Protestant doctrine was identical with early Christian doctrine, the name Protestant was but a synonym for a number of other words, such as 'Berengarians', 'Henricians', 'Lollards', 'Hussites', and 'Christians'.⁸⁴⁸ However incomprehensible Featley's answer is within the parameters of modern scholarship, it cannot be denied that such an answer shifted the focus away from Luther. The Catholic question, 'where was your Church before Luther?', did not resound among the English but instead revealed a distinctly Catholic perception of recent history.

⁸⁴⁵ Featley, *The Romish Fisher Cavght and Held in his Owne Net*, no pag., but this comment can be found on the third and fourth pages of the Epistle Dedicatory.

⁸⁴⁶ Featley, *The Fisher Caught in his Owne Net*, p. 7.

⁸⁴⁷ Featley, *The Romish Fisher Cavght and Held in his Owne Net*, p. 36.

⁸⁴⁸ Ibid., sig. L3*.

Other texts, apparently unconcerned with directly addressing Fisher and his colleagues, also sought to neutralize the importance that Catholic apologists ascribed to Luther. A good example of this is Richard Bernard's 1623 work *Looke beyond Luther*, which bore the explanatory subtitle 'Or an Answer to that Qvestion, so often and so insvltingly proposed by our Aduersaries, asking vs; *Where this our Religion was before Luthers time?*'⁸⁴⁹ Bernard returned to this question throughout the volume,⁸⁵⁰ and his collective answers proved popular enough to see a second impression in 1624. The main body of *Looke beyond Luther* consisted of six arguments concerning English belief, each of which began with a syllogism and was used to show that English orthodoxy—which Bernard freely identified as Protestant—predated then-current Catholic belief. Two of these sections were apologetic: the fourth, which appealed to contemporary Catholic practice as a covert argument for English orthodoxy, and the last, which claimed that God was 'the Author, and continuall Preseruer of our Religion, against all oppositions.'⁸⁵¹ The other four arguments appealed to history: the origins and content of the Bible (section one), martyrs ancient and modern (section two), the early Church (section three), and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (section five). Each of these arguments claimed time and again that Protestantism predated Luther and was synonymous with early Christian orthodoxy. In Bernard's words, 'Protestants are of the Catholike Church, though no Romanists.'⁸⁵² Like so many of his contemporaries, Bernard identified the parameters of Catholic orthodoxy as having been codified in the first 600 years of Christian history.⁸⁵³ Although an occasional conformist, Bernard did not appeal to the Biblical primitivism so often associated with Puritans. Nor did he, like his Catholic opponents, look to Luther as a key figure of any kind, as indicated by the very

⁸⁴⁹ Richard Bernard, *Looke beyond Luther* (London, 1623; STC 1956.7).

⁸⁵⁰ Ibid., e.g., sig. A3v, pp. 1, 2, 12, 24 – 8, 35, 37, 38.

⁸⁵¹ Ibid., p. 35.

⁸⁵² Ibid., p. 41.

⁸⁵³ Ibid., pp. 24 – 5, 31, 43.

title *Looke beyond Luther*. Bernard sought to neutralize the Catholic heresiological emphasis upon Luther, but this only reflected preexisting English assumptions. German Protestants, particularly Lutherans, hailed Luther as a hero and prophet, as ‘our German apostle and third Elijah’.⁸⁵⁴ Some popular German Protestant texts claimed that Luther fulfilled centuries-old prophecies, while others attributed to Luther miraculous powers, such as the ability to foresee the future.⁸⁵⁵ England saw nothing similar. For the English, Luther was a figure of only secondary importance.

V.

Quite unlike their comparative disinterest in Luther, a number of Stuart authors revealed considerable interest in Tudor history. Two of Shakespeare’s plays touched upon the events of the 1530s. One was the heavily censored *Sir Thomas More*, which may have never been performed.⁸⁵⁶ The other was *All is True*, also known as *King Henry VIII*. Its performance history is complex. It was performed on 29 June 1613 at the Globe Theatre, but during the performance the theatre caught fire and it was not performed there again until 1628, after the theatre had been rebuilt. There may have been earlier performances as far back as 1608, but it seems to have been most influential after the Restoration.⁸⁵⁷ The Prologue of the play, like its title, indicated that the question of truth was at the heart of the work:

Those that can pity here / May, if they think it well, let fall a tear: / The subject will
deserve it. Such as give / Their money out of hope they may believe / May here find truth,

⁸⁵⁴ Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero*, p. 130.

⁸⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 129; for Lutheran miracle culture more generally, particularly that surrounding Luther, see R. W. Scribner, ‘Incombustible Luther: The Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany’, *Past & Present*, No. 110 (Feb., 1986), pp. 38 – 68.

⁸⁵⁶ William Shakespeare, *Sir Thomas More*, edited by John Jowett, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (A & C Black Publishers, 2011), pp. 5 – 8, 96.

⁸⁵⁷ William Shakespeare, *King Henry VIII*, edited by Gordon McMullan, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (A & C Black Publishers, 2000), pp. 8 – 17.

too. Those that come to see / Only a show or two and so agree / The play may pass, if
they be still and willing / I'll undertake may see away their shilling / Richly in two short
hours. Only they / That come to hear a merry, bawdy play, / A noise of targets, or to see a
fellow / In a long motley coat guarded with yellow, / Will be deceived.⁸⁵⁸

Some facets of the play were indebted to long-standing Catholic criticisms of the Henrician court. The stage directions had Cardinal Wolsey first appear while walking behind a purse, alluding to the allegations of Wolsey's greed made by figures Sander, who described the Cardinal as 'daring and ambitious beyond his fellows'.⁸⁵⁹ In other ways, the play broke with such criticisms; Anne was nowhere described as the king's daughter. More importantly, *Henry VIII* ended with the birth of Elizabeth, and in the last scene Archbishop Cranmer prophesied: 'For heaven now bids me; and the words I utter / Let none think flattery, for they'll find 'em truth.'⁸⁶⁰ Foreseeing the future of the infant queen, the Archbishop said that she would be 'A pattern to all princes',⁸⁶¹ and that 'Truth shall nurse her; / Holy and heavenly thoughts still counsel her.'⁸⁶² But the praise proved bittersweet. The Archbishop continued, 'She shall be loved and feared',⁸⁶³ and in this same vein of thought brought the matter around to the accession of James: 'Peace, plenty, love, truth, terror, / That were the servants to this chosen infant, / Shall then be his, and like a vine grow to him.'⁸⁶⁴ The Epilogue witnessed to the divisions within England over religion, and began with the wry observation, ''Tis ten to one this play can never please / All that are here.'⁸⁶⁵ This was truth indeed.

⁸⁵⁸ Ibid., Prologue.5 – 17, pp. 209 – 10.

⁸⁵⁹ Ibid., 1.1.115, p. 222; Nicholas Sander, *Rise and Growth of the English Schism*, trans. by David Lewis (Burns and Oates, 1877), p. 11.

⁸⁶⁰ Shakespeare, *King Henry VIII*, 5.4.15 – 16, p. 429.

⁸⁶¹ Ibid., 5.4.23, p. 429.

⁸⁶² Ibid., 5.4.28 – 9, p. 430.

⁸⁶³ Ibid., 5.4.30, p. 430.

⁸⁶⁴ Ibid., 5.4.47 – 9, p. 431.

⁸⁶⁵ Ibid., Epilogue.1 – 2, p. 433.

Edward VI also received important treatment during James' reign. The antiquarian John Hayward wrote *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth*,⁸⁶⁶ the first complete history of Edwardian England. It was published posthumously in 1630, and when a second printing appeared in 1636, it also contained *The Beginning of the Reigne of Queene Elizabeth*, a substantial selection from Hayward's *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, which was not published in its entirety until 1840.⁸⁶⁷ John Bruce, the nineteenth century editor of the *Annals*, records that before it was fully edited and printed, it 'was entirely lost sight of by historical enquirers.'⁸⁶⁸ The same cannot be said of Hayward's history of Edward VI. Regrettably, we do not know when Hayward wrote this work but as the first study of Edward's reign, it exercised a considerable influence over subsequent historiography for several centuries. Hayward's perspective on the boy king's reign is largely out of step with contemporary historiography, such as that surveyed in chapter two, which frequently portrays Edward VI as an agent of militant Protestantism. Barrett L. Beer, the most recent editor of *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth*, observed that Hayward revealed 'no interest in the development of the Catholic church, the Reformation, or the Church of England', and was 'indifferent to Luther and Calvin as well as leading Anglican apologists.'⁸⁶⁹ Barrett did not consider the possibility that Hayward's silence was due to the fact that he, like his contemporaries, had no concept of a historical event called *the* Reformation, and therefore had no reason to pay special attention to those figures who are now considered its leading representatives.

⁸⁶⁶ John Hayward, *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth*, edited by Barrett L. Beer (The Kent State University Press, 1993). All citations will come from this edition.

⁸⁶⁷ Ibid., *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, edited by John Bruce (The Camden Society, 1840).

⁸⁶⁸ Ibid., p. xxviii. The marginalia contained in the 1840 edition of the *Annals* is not found in the 1636 edition *The Beginning of the Reigne of Queene Elizabeth*.

⁸⁶⁹ Hayward, *Edward VI*, p. 4.

The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth began with Anglo-Scottish relations, a topic that Hayward also published a political treatise on in 1604. Hayward supported the union of the kingdoms and described it as ‘a worke most proper to Gods omnipotent arme’. Although union failed under Edward VI, it later came about ‘by milder meanes’—an oblique but glowing reference to the happier reign of James VI and I.⁸⁷⁰ This allusion to England’s first Stuart monarch offset a continuous theme throughout the work: the discord and violence that littered the landscape of Edwardian England. Unlike John Olde’s rhetorically effusive 1555 *apologia* for Edward VI, Hayward bluntly stated in the opening pages of his work that ‘Assuredly both for the time of his age and raigne, he [Edward VI] is rather to bee admired then commended’.⁸⁷¹ Much of this was due to Hayward’s dislike of the young king’s council. He described Archbishop Cranmer as ‘violent both by perswasions and entrieties’,⁸⁷² and he depicted Somerset as ‘a man little esteemed either for wisdom or personage’, whose impiety was eventually met with divine wrath.⁸⁷³ With unapologetic prose, Hayward embellished Northumberland as ‘sometimes almost dissolute’, driven by ‘a great spirit and highly aspiring, not forebearing to make any mischief the meanes for attaining his ambitious endes.’⁸⁷⁴ With such people at the helm of state, it is unsurprising that Hayward criticized the way that religion changed in Edwardian England. Drawing upon Livy, Cicero, Tacitus, and other ancient Roman authors, Hayward approached religion as an integral part of the state’s wellbeing. ‘I will not deny but that some change in religion is often expedient and sometimes necessary’, Hayward wrote, but it ‘must be done with a soft and tender hand’.⁸⁷⁵ In this, the boy king’s council manifestly failed.

⁸⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 62.

⁸⁷¹ Ibid., p. 33.

⁸⁷² Ibid., p. 37.

⁸⁷³ Ibid., pp. 44, 101.

⁸⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 45.

⁸⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 67.

As Hayward told the story, the social strife in mid-sixteenth century England was due to a mixture of vices—the greed of the wealthy and the suspicion of the wider populace. He began his discussion of religion in Edwardian England with the king’s injunctions: ‘soon after the beginning of the young kings raigne, certaine injunctions were set forth for remouing images out of Churches which had beene highly, not onely esteemed but honoured before, and for abolishing or altering some other ancient observations in the Church.’⁸⁷⁶ No space was devoted to doctrinal debate, even when Hayward noted contention over the celebration of the mass;⁸⁷⁷ he instead detailed the societal effects of these changes. Of these, the most important was the sale of ecclesiastical land, which ‘enriched many, and enobled some, and thereby made them firme in maintaining the change.’⁸⁷⁸ The secularization of the Church’s land was followed by iconoclasm, which proved especially controversial among the wider population. It was done ‘in such vnseasonable and vnseasoned fashion’ that ‘many did expresse a sense of distast’.⁸⁷⁹ Far from settling religion, these changes led to ‘tempests of sedition’ throughout England, from Kent to Yorkshire.⁸⁸⁰ But the story was not all bad; Hayward supported the development of the Book of Common Prayer. Drawing upon the regime’s response to the Devonshire rebels, Hayward interpreted liturgical change as minimalistic, and this made popular resistance to the new liturgy appear all the more foolish. Borrowing directly from Edward VI’s letter to the rebels in Devon, the Book of Common Prayer was described as an English translation of the Latin mass, excepting ‘a few things omitted so fond, that it had bin a shame to haue heard them in English...the masse with great judgment and care was reduced to the same manner as Christ left

⁸⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 68.

⁸⁷⁷ See, e.g., pp. 129 – 30.

⁸⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 69.

⁸⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 70.

⁸⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 75 – 80.

it, as the Apostles vsed it, as the ancient Fathers receaued, practised and left it.⁸⁸¹ The multitude, swept up in needless protest, simply failed to comprehend how little was actually happening to the worship service, even if they apprehended, like Hayward, that other more extreme changes had taken place.

If we look upon antiquarians as forerunners of modern historical scholarship, we will miss two important facets of their work. First, they did not shrink from making normative theological statements. Hayward revealed a concern with sacrilege throughout his work. In a key aside made late in his narrative, he averred, ‘some theologians haue beene imploied to defile places erected only for religion and truth by defending oppressions and factions, destaining their professions, and the good artes which they had learned by publishing odious vntruths vpon report and credite of others.’⁸⁸² The spoliation of churches was ‘in a high degree impious’, and it met with ‘both open dislike from men and much secret reuenge from God.’⁸⁸³ So too, as Edward languished on his deathbed, ‘certaine prodigies were seene either as messengers or signes of some imminent and eminent euill’, among which were the ‘birth of such monsters’, and the appearance of large dolphins and other fish.⁸⁸⁴ Antiquarians may have primarily concerned with creating a source-based narrative, but theirs was by no means a secular historical narrative. Providence was ever present. Second, despite the interest of many British historians today with labeling the confessional commitments of the English church as ‘Protestant’ or ‘Calvinist’, Hayward made no attempt to label the religious changes of Edward’s reign. When discussing the failed attempt at diverting the succession of the crown from Mary to Jane, he simply wrote that part of Edward’s motivation came from ‘the great affection which he bare to the Religion that he

⁸⁸¹ Ibid., p. 79.

⁸⁸² Ibid., p. 100.

⁸⁸³ Ibid., p. 101.

⁸⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 168 – 9.

had established'.⁸⁸⁵ He distinguished this religious practice from 'the auncient forme',⁸⁸⁶ but otherwise offered no descriptive elaboration. *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth* was a detailed account of sacrilege, sedition, and social chaos, but it did not enable its earliest readers to apply broad confessional labels such as 'Protestant' or 'Catholic', or even more specific labels such as 'Anglican', 'Calvinist', or 'Lutheran' to the Edwardian chapter of English religious history.

The *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* reflects many of the same concerns found in Hayward's work on Edward VI. Both volumes revealed an interest in the social consequences of religious division, and both works set forth moderation as a vitally important political virtue that leaders must have but which the common people generally lack. The first topic that received sustained attention in the *Annals* was 'the change in Religion which then insued'.⁸⁸⁷ Whereas Edward's council failed time and again in its approach to religion, Elizabeth succeeded almost effortlessly. Recognizing the existence of religious divisions at the very beginning of her reign, the queen sought to constrain their potential for social disruption. From Hayward's viewpoint, Elizabeth transcended the religious divisions of her day. She counted both Catholics and Protestants among her counselors, and according to Hayward, 'All these the Queene ruled with such moderation, as shee was never obnoxious to any of them, and all devoted and addicted to her.'⁸⁸⁸ The 'moderation' of the queen stood in sharp contrast with the lack thereof among the wider populace. The people 'immoderately' praised the exiles when they returned to England after Mary's death,⁸⁸⁹ and when Elizabeth sent out commissioners to remove images from the churches, the populace joined in, 'declaring themselves noe lesse

⁸⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 174.

⁸⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 176.

⁸⁸⁷ Hayward, *Annals*, p. 4.

⁸⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 12.

⁸⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

disorder'd in defacing of them then they had been immoderate and excessive in adoring them before'.⁸⁹⁰ Hayward elaborated, 'Soe difficult it is when men runn out of one extreeme not to runn into the other, but to make a stable staye in the meane. The extreemes in religion are superstitione and prophan[iti]e, eyther negligence, or contempt: betweene which extreames it is extremly hard to hold the meane.'⁸⁹¹ Like Edward VI, whose religion received no confessional label, this Elizabethan mean, located between superstition and prophanity, was also left unnamed.

Like the history of Elizabeth's younger brother, the *Annals* discussed Anglo-Scottish relations. Here too religion was a topic of principal interest. Hayward took a strong interest in the religious violence instigated by the Brethren, and remarked that they were denounced by Mary of Guise as 'rebells'.⁸⁹² Maintaining the same negative vision of the populace that informed his work on Edward VI, Hayward wrote that after Knox's movement was joined by 'the multitude', rioting rapidly followed:

Hereupon he assembled manie of his followers, and, haveinge first inflamed them to furie by a sermon, they began in Perth, otherwise called St. John's towne, and from thence proceeded in other places, to pull downe images and altars, to abolishe reliques, and to overthrowe howses of religious persons, seizing upon their lyvinges and goodes; not the weakest argument for their overthrowe.⁸⁹³

The queen sought to control the spiraling social disruption, but led astray by the French, she only made a bad situation worse. The Scottish Lords then tried to remedy the situation, but rather than siding with their own queen, they instead contacted Elizabeth and asked her to intervene. In an appeal rife with implications for his own time, Hayward framed a speech in which the Scottish

⁸⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 28.

⁸⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 28 – 9.

⁸⁹² Ibid., p. 41.

⁸⁹³ Ibid., p. 42.

Lords said, ‘We desire to reforme our church, and to conforme it to tymes of antiquitie, wherin we follow your owne example’.⁸⁹⁴ By making the English church the standard of reform, Hayward completely inverted the standard Puritan apologetic that the Scottish church, unlike that of England, had been reformed. He thus came close to viewpoint of James VI and I, whose disdain for Scottish religious practices and whose support the English church had been made so clear at the Hampton Court Conference. Through a historiographical *coup d’état* that transformed the Scottish Lords into a prop for Jacobean orthodoxy, Hayward’s account of Anglo-Scottish relations privileged both the English and Elizabeth’s religious settlement.

VI.

When Charles I inherited the throne in 1625, preexisting debates about Spain and Arminianism shaped the theological arguments of Caroline England, which soon became intertwined with calls for reformation of the English church. The first debate concerned whether or not the canons passed by the Synod of Dort were binding on the Church of England. There was comparatively little debate about this before Charles, but in the last days of James’ reign, Richard Montagu published *A Gagg for the new Gospell?*, an anti-Catholic treatise that quite unexpectedly earned him the ire of his equally non-Catholic co-religionists. Montagu denied that the Synod of Dort held the same authority for the English church that Trent held for Roman Catholics, and in his discussion of predestination, he made several references to Lutheran theology to show that Dort’s conclusions were not held by all Protestant churches.⁸⁹⁵ This included the Church of England, which left such matters open to personal interpretation in the

⁸⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 46.

⁸⁹⁵ Richard Montagu, *A Gagg for the New Gospell?* (London, 1624; STC 18038), e.g., pp. 158 – 9, 179.

seventeenth of its Articles of Religion.⁸⁹⁶ Montagu then went on to reject supralapsarianism in particular and, much like Dort, pleaded for theological caution and intellectual restraint. ‘Man, in curiosity, hath presumed farre vpon, and waded deep into the hidden Secrets of the Almighty; no-where more, or with greater Presumption, than where that grand Apostle stood at gaze, with *O the depth!* and in consideration cried out, *How unsearchable are his waies!*’⁸⁹⁷ A small pamphlet war followed which accused Montagu of not only harboring Arminian sentiments, but of embracing Roman Catholic theology. During the ensuing controversy, several English polemicists linked purportedly Arminian theology with Roman Catholicism.⁸⁹⁸ The assertion of a link between Arminianism and Catholicism was not new; John Yates alleged this connection as far back as 1615,⁸⁹⁹ but it did not catch on at the time. Rather, as already noted above, Arminianism was generally seen as a political phalanx connected to Catholicism because it supposedly worked covertly for the Spanish government. However, in England, the latter half of the 1620s saw new portrayals of Arminianism which collectively served to redefine it.

In 1626, Charles issued ‘A Proclamation for the establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England.’ The king declared ‘his utter dislike to all those, who to shew the subtilty of their wits, or to please their owne humours, or vent their owne passions, doe, or shall aduerture to stirre or moue any new Opinions, not only contrary, but differing from the sound and Orthodoxall grounds of the true Religion, sincerely professed, and happily established, in the Church of *England*’. Charles repudiated ‘the least innouation’ and commanded

⁸⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 179 – 80.

⁸⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 178; Montagu is citing Romans 11:33.

⁸⁹⁸ Daniel Featley, *Pelagius Redivivus* (London, 1626; STC 10736); Anthony Wotton, *A Dangerovs Plot Discovered* (London, 1626; STC 26003); John Yates, *Ibis ad Caesarem* (London, 1626; STC 26083); William Pemble, *Vindiciae Gratiae* (London, 1627; STC 19591); also relevant here are the 1626 reprinting of Pierre Du Moulin, *The Anatomy of Arminianism* (London, 1620; STC 7308), and George Carleton, *An Examination of...the Doctrines of the Church of England* (London, 1626; STC 4634).

⁸⁹⁹ John Yates, *Gods Arraignement of Hypocrites* (London, 1615; STC 26081).

especially those who are Church-men...that from hencefoorth they cary themselues so wisely, warily, and conscionably, that neither by Writing, Preaching, Printing, Conferences, or other wise, they raise any doubts, or publish, or maintaine any new inventions or opinions concerning Religion, then such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of *England*, heretofore published, and established by authoritie.⁹⁰⁰

Nicholas Tyacke interprets this proclamation as a proscription of Calvinism, although he concedes that ‘the proclamation as printed does not mention Arminianism by name’.⁹⁰¹ Nothing in Charles’ words indicate a concern to address or inhibit any specific theological doctrine or school of thought. This changed two years later when the king sought to restrain debate on predestination, but we should be wary of imposing later, more specific concerns upon this earlier proclamation. If we set aside Tyacke’s argument from silence, the king’s words appear as nothing more than a broad directive to all sides of theological debate to avoid dividing the national church.

It was not until 1628 that Charles, by again ratifying the Elizabethan Articles of Religion, addressed the disruptive effects of predestinarian debate. He prefaced the new edition of the Articles with a declaration in which he expressed his concern that theological argument ‘may nourish faction both in the Church and Common-wealth’.⁹⁰² On predestination, Charles commanded, ‘Wee will that all further curious search be layd aside, and these disputes shut vp in Gods promises, as they be generally set foorth to Vs, in the holy Scriptures; and the generall meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them.’ As with his earlier

⁹⁰⁰ Charles I, ‘A Proclamation for the establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England’ (London, 1626; STC 8824).

⁹⁰¹ Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, p. 48, and see also p. 157; idem., ‘Archbishop Laud’, in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603 – 1642* (Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 51 – 70, here pp. 65 – 6.

⁹⁰² Charles I, ‘His Maiesties Declaration’, in The Church of England, *Articles* (London, 1628; STC 10051), p. 2.

proclamation of 1626, the king offered a general censure upon all sides of the debate. Referring to controversy over the Thirty-Nine Articles' seventeenth article, the king further specified that 'no man hereafter shall either print or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plaine and full meaning thereof: And shall not put his owne sense or Comment to bee the meaning of the Article, but shal take it in the literall and Gramaticall sense.'⁹⁰³ Far from being 'anti-Calvinist' or 'Arminian', the king's words dovetailed with those of the Synod of Dort, which similarly decreed that the doctrine of election should be taught 'without any curious searching into the ways of the most High'.⁹⁰⁴ This was not missed by those living at the time, most notably William Prynne, who saw no inconsistency in appealing to both the canons of Dort and Charles' Proclamation on the Articles of Religion.⁹⁰⁵ But before we continue this line of discussion, we must turn to the second major theological controversy of Caroline England.

In 1627, John Cosin published *A Collection of Private Devotions*. It proved popular and reached no less than eleven editions by the end of the century. Commissioned by Charles I as both a concession and a response to Catholic accusations that his subjects lacked devotional discipline, Cosin's *Devotions* was the first official devotional work issued in the seventeenth century. The last royally-sponsored devotionals had been published under Queen Elizabeth, the *Primer* and the *Orarium*. Cosin partly based his devotional manual upon his Elizabethan forerunners, but he also incorporated material from the Book of Common Prayer, the writings of the Church Fathers, and contemporary Roman Catholic primers. P. G. Stanwood, the most recent editor of Cosin's *Devotions*, emphasizes that although Cosin borrowed from Catholic sources, 'his work is, from a doctrinal point of view, firmly in the tradition of the Book of Common

⁹⁰³ Ibid., pp. 4 – 5.

⁹⁰⁴ The Canons of Dort, I.XIV, in Milton (ed.), *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort*, p. 300.

⁹⁰⁵ William Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, e.g., sig. ¶2r – v.

Prayer.⁹⁰⁶ Nonetheless, this Caroline primer attracted controversy and within months of its publication was derided for its purportedly ‘popish’ content. At least three separate attacks were published against it,⁹⁰⁷ but it was the work of William Prynne that fundamentally transformed Caroline religious controversy.

Prynne subsumed debates about Arminianism to longer standing arguments about reformation. In *A Briefe Survey and Censvre of Mr Cozens His Couzening Deuotions*, he did more than re-assert a relationship between Arminianism and Catholicism: he redefined Arminianism as a series of ceremonial innovations inspired by Catholicism. Prynne offered no proof that Arminius or his associates valued ceremonies of any sort, but he did produce documentary evidence that revealed parallels between the *Devotions* and the material in Catholic devotionals. Prynne consistently assumed that correlation indicated direct causation. This was most evident in his recognition that Cosin’s *Devotions*, like similar Catholic works, contained translations of such popular texts as the Apostles’ Creed and the Lord’s Prayer.⁹⁰⁸ Such material was hardly unique to Catholic works; the Apostles’ Creed and the Lord’s Prayer could be found in sixteenth-century confessional standards as diverse as the Heidelberg Catechism, the Book of Concord, and the Elizabethan *Primer*. Given the influence of the last of these upon Cosin, Prynne’s claims should not be taken at face value. But some of his arguments were insightful, most notably his observations that Cosin’s *Devotions* emphasized some of the same holy days as some Catholic primers, and that Cosin, like his Catholic contemporaries, advocated showing reverence in church by bowing toward the altar.⁹⁰⁹ At the time, Prynne did not connect this

⁹⁰⁶ John Cosin, *A Collection of Private Devotions*, edited by P. G. Stanwood with Daniel O’Connor (Oxford University Press, 1967), p. xxx.

⁹⁰⁷ Henry Burton, *A Tryall of Private Devotions* (London, 1628; STC 4157); Peter Smart, *The Vantie & Downe-Fall of Syperstitionvs Popish Ceremonies* (London, 1628; STC 22640.7); William Prynne, *A Briefe Survey and Censvre of Mr Cozens His Couzening Deuotions* (London, 1628; STC 20455a).

⁹⁰⁸ Prynne, *A Briefe Survey and Censvre of Mr Cozens His Couzening Deuotion*, pp. 54 – 65.

⁹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 64 – 5.

practice with the decades-old Puritan complaint against bowing at the name of Jesus, although two years later he began to protest against it as well.⁹¹⁰ In 1628, Prynne simply drew upon the well-worn polemic that Arminianism and Catholicism conspired together. Because Cosin's *Devotions* revealed some Catholic influence, they were implicated in this same Arminian-Catholic conspiracy—and this in turn revealed the Arminian-Catholic axis as not just political, but ceremonial and devotional in nature.

In his 1629 treatise *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, Prynne brought together his polemics against Arminianism, Catholicism, and Cosin. He again alleged that Arminianism necessitated the devotional practices found in works such as Cosin's *Devotions*,⁹¹¹ and he also repeated the still older view that Arminianism was a prop to 'universall Spanish, Papall Monarchie'.⁹¹² Like most other writings against 'Arminianism', Prynne showed little knowledge of Arminian theology, which he summarized as 'Freewill; the Resistability of grace; Conditionall, yea mutable Election; with totall and final Apostasie from the State of grace'.⁹¹³ Throughout his diatribe against Cosin, Prynne had repeatedly asserted the existence of 'Protestant' unity against 'Arminian' and 'Catholic' innovations.⁹¹⁴ At the time, he offered no evidence for this doctrinal concurrence, but *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis* rectified this deficiency. First, in order to show doctrinal harmony between the Church of England and European Protestant churches, Prynne needed to find a baseline level of theological similarity. However, because he advocated supralapsarian doctrine, he had to amass a body of theological evidence that was strong enough to support his claim that the English church and Protestant

⁹¹⁰ William Prynne, *Anti-Arminianism* (London, 1630; STC 20458), concludes with an appendix against bowing beginning on sig. O^o*2. *Anti-Arminianism* was a second, revised and expanded edition of *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis*.

⁹¹¹ Prynne, *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis*, if following from sig. ¶, this would be sig. ¶4v – ¶¶.

⁹¹² Ibid., sig. c3v.

⁹¹³ Ibid.

⁹¹⁴ Prynne, *A Briefe Svrvey and Censvre of Mr Cozens His Couzening Deuotions*, e.g., pp. 7, 8, 20, 32, 79.

churches abroad taught the same theology. To this end, he invented a list of English doctrinal standards that he denoted the ‘seuerall grand Charters’. Two of these, the Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer, had been made canonically normative in 1604. Prynne’s list also included the catechism of Edward VI and the two books of homilies published under Edward and Elizabeth, the latter of which were endorsed by the Articles of Religion. But Prynne also appealed to a number of texts that had never received the formal assent of the English church—an attempted revision of the Articles of Religion rejected by Queen Elizabeth and subsequently called the Lambeth Articles, the theological recantation of the late-sixteenth century theologian William Barrett, and the 1615 Articles of Ireland. The first two had never had any official standing in England, and last does not appear to have ever been adopted in Ireland.⁹¹⁵ It is telling that Prynne made no appeal to the canons of 1604, the Authorized Version of the Bible, or the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus. With his novel and partial list of confessional standards, Prynne could easily and successfully argue that supralapsarian doctrine was the official doctrine of the Church of England.

Prynne then used the same theological principium—supralapsarianism—to define orthodox Protestantism. He made no appeals to any Lutheran authors, including Martin Luther. The only reference made to Lutheranism came by way of attacking those whom he termed ‘Pseudo-Lutheran’ writers, and whom he placed in the same company as Arminians and Catholics.⁹¹⁶ No Lutheran author was named, but Prynne may have been thinking of Johann Gerhard. Among Lutherans, Gerhard proved to be the most influential theologian of the seventeenth century, and his massive *Theological Commonplaces* became the gold standard of Lutheran scholasticism. Gerhard’s devotional writings were permeated with doctrinal content,

⁹¹⁵ Prynne, *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis*, p. 3. John McCafferty, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633 – 1641* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 63 – 8.

⁹¹⁶ Prynne, *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis*, sig. c2; see also pp. 131, 134.

and by the time that Prynne wrote *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis*, seven editions of Gerhard's devotional writings had been published in England. One of these, *The Conquest of Temptations*, listed the fear of reprobation among the temptations that Christians must overcome. Like Dort, Montague, and Charles I, Gerhard was content with theological agnosticism about predestination, first advising, 'The secrets of heauen, let no creature on earth presume to pry into: Enough is reuealed both for our consolation and salvation.' Unlike Prynne and other supralapsarians, Gerhard gave a considerable amount of space to human initiative. Borrowing from the second letter of Peter in the New Testament, Gerhard exhorted his readers to 'make our election sure by the practise of good workes, and holy duties of Religion.'⁹¹⁷ Gerhard denied that God rejected penitent sinners, and thus made his entire meditation on reprobation a rejection of supralapsarian doctrine. Insofar as Prynne's conception of a Protestant consensus rested upon the acceptance of supralapsarianism, then Lutheran, Arminian, and Catholic writers were equally reprobate in their theology.

The phrase 'from the beginning of Reformation to this present' appears several times in Prynne's volume,⁹¹⁸ but he did not specify the meaning of this phrase until the closing pages of his work: 'The *Church of England* was *reformed* by the helpe of our learned and Reuerend *Bishops*, in the dayes of King *Edward* the sixt, and in the beginning of the Raigne of Queen *Elizabeth*.' Prynne then named Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and St. Augustine as the theological authorities that grounded what he called 'first reformation'.⁹¹⁹ His lone definition, however, should not be allowed to obscure Prynne's more consistent interest: antiquity. As evidenced by his incorporation of lengthy marginalia, Prynne took the Church Fathers very seriously, and he

⁹¹⁷ Johann (Iohn) Gerhard, *The Conquest of Temptations* (London, 1614; STC 11767.5), pp. 26 – 7.

⁹¹⁸ Prynne, *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis*, e.g., pp. 2, 3, 52; see also what would be sig. a4 if following on from sig. a.

⁹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 127 – 8.

cited figures as diverse as Vincent of Lerins, Leo the Great, and Bernard of Clairvaux.⁹²⁰ Dividing church history between ‘ancient and moderne’,⁹²¹ he understood antiquity to be a remarkably long period. He described Bede, Anselm, Bradwardine, and Wyclif as key doctrinal authorities for ‘the Primatue Church of *England*’.⁹²² In their doctrine, he averred, they all agreed with St. Augustine. Prynne primarily understood the ‘first reformation’ of the English church as a return to orthodox Augustinian theology. He claimed that this doctrine was ‘anciently receiued’ and that its true teachers are ‘the Ancient and Moderne Reformers of the Church’.⁹²³ Prynne conceived of ‘reformation’ as a return to orthodox antiquity, and he believed that under Edward VI and Elizabeth, the same had been reinstated because the moderns again sat at the feet of the ancients. Ironically, in order to make this argument Prynne also had to advance his own unique vision of English orthodoxy.

VII.

In the 1630s, the crown pursued an attempted ecclesiastical convergence among the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The Church of England was held up as the model and the liturgies and canons of the other two churches were revised accordingly. The first revised canon law was passed in Ireland in 1634. It contained 100 canons that largely followed the order of the 1604 canon law of the Church of England. The first Irish canon was entitled ‘Of the agreement of the church of England and Ireland, in the profession of the same Christian Religion.’⁹²⁴ Affirming an identical understanding of doctrine and sacramental practice, the canon stated, ‘Wee doe receive and approve’ the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion promulgated

⁹²⁰ Ibid., p. 1 (Vincent), p. 140 (Leo), sig. ¶2 (Bernard).

⁹²¹ Ibid., sig. b3, p. 136.

⁹²² Ibid., p. 120.

⁹²³ Ibid., p. 13, sig. A3.

⁹²⁴ Church of Ireland, *Constitvtions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (Dvblin, 1635; STC 14265), Canon I, p. 9.

under Elizabeth.⁹²⁵ This was the first time that the Irish church had accepted England's confessional standard. The next canon was entitled 'The Kings Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiasticall to be maintained.' It claimed that papal power 'is for most just causes, taken away and abolished'.⁹²⁶ The doctrine of monarchy contained in this canon came directly out of the second English canon, and simply applied that canon's claims about the English crown to the Irish crown. As in England, in Ireland it became an offense punishable with excommunication to maintain 'that the Kings Majestie hath not the same authority in causes Ecclesiasticall, that the godly Kings had amongst the Iewes, and Christian Emperours in the Primitive Church'.⁹²⁷ Unified around faith and liturgy, the English and Irish churches were no less unified in their understanding of royal and ecclesiastical authority.

The above clauses and their attendant penalty were copied directly into the Scottish canon law revision of 1636.⁹²⁸ Scotland's canon law revision was noticeably shorter than that of Ireland and consisted of only nineteen chapters, but its goal was the same. The new canons declared that the Church of Scotland was, like the Church of Ireland, in 'agreement' with 'the church of England...in the profession of the same Christian Religion'. Its authors sought to bring the deeply divided Scottish church into the orbit of the Church of England, but made select concessions to proponents of Presbyterianism. The canons said nothing about acceptance of the Thirty-Nine Articles, although they excommunicated those who claimed that the liturgies in the Book of Common Prayer '*contayne in them anie thing repugnant to the Scriptures, or are corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful in the service & worship of GOD*'.⁹²⁹ The canons also contained a concession to those who objected to the word 'priest' by only using the word

⁹²⁵ Ibid., Canon I, p. 10.

⁹²⁶ Ibid., Canon II, p. 11.

⁹²⁷ Ibid., Canon II, pp. 11 – 12.

⁹²⁸ Church of Scotland, *Canons and Constitvtions Ecclesiasticall* (Aberdeen, 1636; STC 22055), Chap. I.2, p. 8.

⁹²⁹ Ibid., Chap. I.3, p. 8.

‘presbyter’ throughout. In one instance, the canons sought to split the difference between Catholic and Presbyterian approaches to the Eucharist, identifying the former with ‘*the adoration of the Bread*’ and the latter with ‘*the unreverend communicating, and not discerning of those holie Mysteriee*’. The canon resolved that ‘the holie Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper bee received with the bowing of the knee; to testifie the devotion and thankfulnesse of the Receavers, for that most excellent Gift.’⁹³⁰ But even if not calculated to offend, the canons were unlikely to appease either side. The second chapter of the canons directed that no one was to be ordained ‘vnlesse hee first subscrybe, to bee obedient to the Canons of the Church.’⁹³¹ This effectively prevented hardline Presbyterians from entering holy orders. The King James/Authorised Version of the Bible became the only translation allowed,⁹³² and every parish was ordered to place a font for baptism near the entrance of the church.⁹³³ ‘SACRAMENTALL CONFESSION and ABSOLVTION’ was mandated as a necessary and normative pastoral practice,⁹³⁴ and clergy were directed to use the rite found in the liturgy for the visitation of the sick—a point of some interest given the ambiguity concerning the same in the Edwardian canon law. In the contest between advocates and opponents of episcopacy, the Presbyterians were most constricted by the new canons.

There was a significant difference between the amount of space given to synods in the Irish and Scottish canons. The Irish canons concluded with a single canon that affirmed in one paragraph that the ‘Nationall Synod’ of the Irish church was ‘the representative body of the Church of Ireland, in the name of Christ, and by the Kings authority’, and that its determinations,

⁹³⁰ Ibid., Chap. VI.6, p. 21.

⁹³¹ Ibid., Chap. II.10, p. 11.

⁹³² Ibid., Chap. XVI.1, p. 31.

⁹³³ Ibid., Chap. XVI.2, p. 31.

⁹³⁴ Ibid., Chap. XVIII.9, p. 39.

once ‘ratified & confirmed’, were binding upon the wider Irish church.⁹³⁵ The Scottish canons spent far more time upon this topic, dedicating just over two pages to it in its eighth chapter, ‘Of SYNODES’. After directing the bishops to call diocesan synods twice each year, the authority to call a national synod was expressly identified as belonging to the king alone. This affected how the Church of Scotland could reform its own practices. The last section of the eighth chapter began by denying ‘that it is lawfull for anie Presbyter, or Lay-man, joyntlie, or severallie, to make Rules, Orders, or Constitutions, in causes Ecclesiasticall’. The chapter concluded by warning,

But for-as-much as no reformation in Doctrine or Discipline, can bee made perfect at once in anie Church; THEREFORE it shall and may be lawfull, for the Church of *SCOTLAND*, at anie tyme, to make Remonstrance to His Majestie, or His Successoures, what they conceaue fit to bee taken in farther consideration, in, and concerning the Premisses. And if the King shall therevpon declare his lyking, and approbation, then both Clergie and Lay shall yield their obedience, without incurring the Censure afore-sayde, or anie other. But it shall not bee lawfull for the Bishops themselues, in a *NATIONALL SYNOD*, or otherwise, to alter anie Rubricke, Article, Canon Doctrinall, or Disciplinarie, what-so-ever; vnder the payne aboue mentioned, and HIS MAJESTIE’S farther displeasure.

With strictures such as these, the reformation pursued by the Brethren was wholly illegal and could never be repeated. The canons granted only the impetus for reformation to the bishops. The right of reformation was restricted to the king. This was a line of thought that Charles would continue to develop in the 1640s during the civil wars, and it evinced an understanding of ecclesiastical authority that the king’s opponents would contest in diverse ways on both sides of the Anglo-Scots border.

⁹³⁵ Church of Ireland, *Constitvtions and Canons Ecclesiasticall*, Canon C, p. 113.

The canons of 1636 were followed in 1637 with a Scottish Book of Common Prayer. It was, like the canons of the previous year, dependent upon the English model, but the new service book was neither an English imposition nor a Caroline innovation. It owed its origins at least in part to William Cowper, the bishop of Galloway, who began to draft a new liturgy for the Scottish church before his death in 1619.⁹³⁶ The Preface noted that James VI and I strove ‘to work this uniformitie in all his Dominions’ but was prevented from doing so because of his death.⁹³⁷ Charles I, ‘not suffering his Fathers good purpose to fall to the ground’, continued and completed James’ work. The Preface also indicated that Charles, like James, was keen to secure both church and state from another revolt like that pursued by the Brethren. In its last paragraph, the Preface made a significant but wholly subversive historical appeal to the sixteenth century by claiming that ‘Our first Reformers were of the same minde with us, as appeareth by the ordinance they made, that in all the Parishes of the Realme, the Common prayer should be read weekly on Sundaies, and other Festivall dayes’. Citing John Knox’s *Historie of the Church of Scotland*, the Preface promised, ‘We keep the words of the historie; *Religion was not then placed in rites and gestures, nor men taken with the fancie of extemporarie prayers.*’⁹³⁸ A series of liturgical services, with comparatively more rubrics than those then in use, followed.

When the Book of Common Prayer was introduced on 23 July 1637, a protest against it at St. Giles cathedral in Edinburgh devolved into a riot. The protesters claimed that the new liturgy was ‘popish’.⁹³⁹ Not all Scots were upset by the new liturgy, but those who were wrote and

⁹³⁶ David George Mullan, ‘Cowper, William (1568–1619)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6509>, accessed 6 July 2014].

⁹³⁷ The Church of Scotland, *The Booke of Common Prayer* (Edinburgh, 1637; STC 16606), sig. a3.

⁹³⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. a3v.

⁹³⁹ For this and what follows, see Joong-Lak Kim, ‘The Scottish-English-Romish Book: the character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637’, in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 15 – 32; John R. Young, ‘the Covenanters and the Scottish Parliament, 1639 – 51: The Rule of the Godly and the ‘Second Scottish Reformation’

adopted the National Covenant in 1638. Because of this, they came to be known as the Scottish Covenanters. The text of the National Covenant began with the Scottish Confession of 1580, also known as the Negative Confession because with its violent polemic against all things considered Catholic, it condemned much but affirmed little. The opening paragraph of the National Covenant sketched a brief history of subscription to the Scottish Confession of 1580; James subscribed in 1580, the wider nation adopted it one year later, and subscription was renewed in 1590. When the Scottish Confession was re-subscribed through the National Covenant in 1638, a number of publications portrayed it as an act of national and spiritual renewal.⁹⁴⁰ With the National Covenant leading the way, this same literature described the 1580 Confession as having effected ‘the reformation of Religion in this Realme.’⁹⁴¹ As Archibald Johnston, Lord Warriston enthused, ‘The Kirk of *Scotland* after the reformation of Religion did by degrees attaine to as great perfection both in doctrine & discipline as any other reformed kirk in *Europe*.’⁹⁴² According to Lord Warriston, the Scottish bishops, as agents of both Catholicism and Arminianism, threatened to subvert the reformation of 1580. The National Covenant was therefore an act ‘for the preservation of true Religion, and liberties of the Countrie established by lawes’.⁹⁴³ Others texts also used the language of ‘preservation’,⁹⁴⁴ and these *apologia* collectively offered a vision of national reformation defined by a single moment—1580—in the recent past. Like the 1637 Book of Common Prayer, an appeal was made here to the sixteenth century—but to the Confession of 1580, rather than the mid-sixteenth century events cited in the

in Elizabeth Boran and Crawford Gribben (eds.), *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550 – 1700* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 131 – 58.

⁹⁴⁰ See, e.g., The Church of Scotland, *The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1638; STC 22026.8); Alexander Henderson, *The Protestation* (Edinburgh, 1638; STC 21904); Archibald Warriston, *A Short Relation of the State of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1638; STC 22039), see what would be sigs. B3v – B4 if following on from sig. B; Anonymous, *The Beast is Wounded* (Amsterdam, 1638; STC 22032.5), p. 17.

⁹⁴¹ The Church of Scotland, *The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland*, p. 8.

⁹⁴² Warriston, *A Short Relation*, sig. A2.

⁹⁴³ Ibid., this would be sig. c3 if following on from sig. c.

⁹⁴⁴ Anonymous, *The Beast is Wounded*, p. 14; Henderson, *The Protestation*, sig. C.

Preface to the Prayer Book. For those who believed that they might finally secure reformation of the English church, the National Covenant became both a model and a rhetorical inspiration.

VIII.

The civil wars of the 1640s saw an exponential growth in publications about reformation. With censorship having broken down, debate proliferated with neither inhibition nor resolution. Many of the publications of the decade were new, but a number of works dating as far back as Elizabeth's reign were republished. Archbishop Bancroft's *Dangerous Positions* was republished in 1640,⁹⁴⁵ and the previously unpublished sixth and eighth books of Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie* appeared in 1648.⁹⁴⁶ The University of Oxford republished its reply to the Millenary Petition in 1641,⁹⁴⁷ and the same year saw the republication of both John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* and his edition of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.⁹⁴⁸ John Ponet's *Shorte Treatise of Politike Power* was reprinted in 1639 and 1642,⁹⁴⁹ as were some of Martin Marprelate's tractates.⁹⁵⁰ The English were fighting as much about their past as they were fighting about anything else.

A number of writings by King James VI and I reappeared as well. Perhaps more than any other figure from the time period, James VI and I was contested by both sides of the civil wars. In 1642, excerpts from the king's 1609 speech before parliament were reprinted as *King James his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant*. It contained an unattributed postscript with

⁹⁴⁵ Richard Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* (London, 1640; STC 1345).

⁹⁴⁶ Richard Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie; The Sixth and Eighth Books* (London, 1648).

⁹⁴⁷ The University of Oxford, *The Humble Petition of the Ministers of the Church of England* (Oxford[?], 1641).

⁹⁴⁸ John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1641); idem., *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (London, 1641).

⁹⁴⁹ John Ponet, *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Power* (London, 1639; STC 20179); idem., *A Short Treatise of Politique Power* (London, 1642).

⁹⁵⁰ Martin Marprelate, *A Dialogue. Wherin is plainly layd open the tyrannicall dealing of lord bishops against Gods children* (Amsterdam[?], 1640; STC 6805.3); idem., *Reformation no Enemie* (London[?], 1641), which was also published as *Hay Any Worke for Cooper* (London[?], 1642).

twenty-eight questions ‘*of things done since King Charles his Reign began*’. This was an anti-Caroline work; it argued against Charles’ personal rule in the 1630s (nn.1 – 4), it alleged that ‘so much Idolatry and Superstition hath overspread England’ (n. 14), and it suspected Jesuit conspiracy in the kingdom (nn. 24 – 26).⁹⁵¹ It was reprinted in 1647 by order of Parliament, but without the questions concerning Charles’ reign; in their place was the oath taken at the coronation.⁹⁵² An almost identically entitled work, *King Iames his Iudgement by Way of Counsell and Advice*, appeared in 1642 as well. It consisted of extracts selected by Andrew Willett, and concluded with an unattributed prayer for Charles I. This was a pro-Caroline work, as indicated by the author’s assertions that ‘haue wee many yeares under our Gracious Sovereaigne enjoyed both true Religion and Peace’, and that Charles I was ‘so godly, pious and Religious a Prince, who is even a pattern of true piety and love to all Princes in the World’.⁹⁵³ Charles I reprinted several of his father’s writings, including *His Majesties Declaration in Defence of the True Protestant Religion* (1643) and *A Declaration Made by King James, in Scotland; Concerning Church-Government, and Presbyters* (1646).⁹⁵⁴ Both affirmed episcopal order and royal oversight of the church. Other supporters of the government took their own initiative; an excerpt of James’ anti-Puritan diatribe in *Basilicon Doron* was republished as *A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours*,⁹⁵⁵ and included an anonymously-authored attack upon nonconformists.

As noted in chapter three, the civil wars saw the first complete printing of John Knox’s *Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*.⁹⁵⁶ It appeared in both London and

⁹⁵¹ James I and Anonymous, *King Iames his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant* (London, 1642), no pag.

⁹⁵² James I and Anonymous, *King James his Opinion and Iudgement, Concerning a Reall King and a Tyrant* (London, 1647).

⁹⁵³ James I and Andrew Willett, *King Iames his Iudgement by Way of Counsell and Advice* (London, 1642), p. 8.

⁹⁵⁴ Charles I, *His Majesties Declaration in Defence of the True Protestant Religion* (Oxford and London, 1643); James I, *A Declaration Made by King James, in Scotland; Concerning Church-Government, and Presbyters* (London, 1646).

⁹⁵⁵ James I and Anonymous, *A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours* (London, 1642).

⁹⁵⁶ John Knox, *The Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1644).

Edinburgh. The first, incomplete printing of the work in 1587 had contained no title page but a running header that read *The Historie of the Church of Scotland*, which is how later authors cited the work; by now adding ‘of the Reformation’ to the title of the work, the history contained within its pages was given a point of thematic focus. The 1644 printing also contained an address to the reader that glorified the work of Knox and his colleagues: ‘thou haste here related what principally passed in Church and State in this our Countrey, during the great work of purging the Church from the Superstitions and Idolatry, and freeing both Church and State from the Tyranny and Slavery of Popery, untill the coming of King *Iames*, our late Sovereaigne, to the Crown of *Scotland*.’ The author further informed the reader that ‘thou haste unfolded unto thee, and made plain, the strong Reasons, and necessary Causes that moved these men who are here named, although infirm and weake in themselves, to undergoe the great Worke of Reformation.’⁹⁵⁷ Here reformation was located to the mid-sixteenth century, rather than to 1580 with the adoption of the National Covenant.

Attempting to fill in the historical gaps between the end of the work and the present moment, the author explained that under James’ reign, bad councilors compelled the king to ‘bring again into Scotland, Prelacy, with all its dependences’.⁹⁵⁸ After James ascended the English throne, things became even worse when these same councilors secured changes in the university curriculum, and ‘they withdrew the Students from the studie of the Scriptures in the Originall, and recommended to them the reading of humane Writings, particularly in Theologie, the Books of the Ancients, which are commonly called *Fathers*.’ Even worse, students studied scholastic theology, which the author decried as ‘the Sophistrie of the Monks, as of *Thomas* and

⁹⁵⁷ Ibid., sig. *2.

⁹⁵⁸ Ibid., sig. *3v.

Scotus namely, with their Expositors.⁹⁵⁹ Purportedly Catholic-sympathizing councilors eventually imposed the 1637 Book of Common Prayer, which was ‘designed at Rome, and perfected at London’.⁹⁶⁰ The address to the reader concluded with accusations of a Catholic conspiracy in which Charles I was complicit: ‘howsoever the Proclamations and Protestations going in the Kings name be soft and smooth as the voice of *Jacob*, yet the hands are rough as of *Esau*, destroyed, and seeking to destroy the true Religion, grounded in Gods word, with the professors thereof, as also the lawfull Liberty of the Countrey, and bring us all unto slavery.’ With Charles I already opposed to Knox’s reformation, reprinting Knox’s *Historie* in 1644 was nothing short of a battle cry.

Most new pamphlets published in the 1640s simply elaborated upon the much older themes of episcopacy and liturgy. In the early years of the civil wars, readers however invested or casual, could peruse parliamentary sermons and speeches,⁹⁶¹ the ‘Root and Branch’ petition and the Millenary Petition,⁹⁶² apologetics against the same,⁹⁶³ rebuttals of these apologetics,⁹⁶⁴ and multiple calls for peace.⁹⁶⁵ John Milton, to look at one famous figure, published his first political pamphlets at this time. They too argued for the abolition of episcopacy and liturgy. The longest of Milton’s early pamphlets was *Of Reformation*, which comprised two books. Beginning with Henry VIII, Milton argued in his first book that the Tudor monarchs had hindered

⁹⁵⁹ Ibid., no pag; this would be sig. *4v if following on from the previous page.

⁹⁶⁰ Ibid., no pag; this would be sig. **4 if following on from the previous page.

⁹⁶¹ See, e.g., Thomas Ford, *Reformation Sure and Stedfast* (London, 1641); Harbottle Grimston, *Master Grimston his worthy and learned speech* (London, 1641). Stephen Marshall, *Reformation and Desolation* (London, 1642).

⁹⁶² See, e.g., Anonymous, *The First and Large Petition of the Citie of London* (London, 1641); this is the so-called ‘Root and Branch Petition’. *The Humble Petition* has already been noted.

⁹⁶³ See, e.g., Anonymous, *An Apology for Bishops* (London, 1641); Joseph Hall, *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament* (London, 1641); idem., *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance* (London, 1641), and idem., *A Letter Sent to an Honourable Gentleman* (London, 1641).

⁹⁶⁴ Smectymnuus, *An Answer to a Book Entitvled An Humble Remonstrance* (London, 1641), *A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance* (London, 1641); John Milton, *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus* (London, 1641).

⁹⁶⁵ Calybutte Downing, *Considerations Toward a Peaceable Reformation in Matters Ecclesiasticall* (London, 1641); John Dury, *Good Counsell for the Peace of Reformed Churches* (London, 1641); W. T., *Regulated Zeal* (London, 1641).

reformation of the English church.⁹⁶⁶ Like Foxe, Milton praised Wyclif, but against Foxe, Milton denied that bishops burned under Mary such as Archbishop Cranmer should be described as martyrs.⁹⁶⁷ He further argued that antiquarians were among the chief opponents of reformation,⁹⁶⁸ and that in the fourth century, the emperor Constantine had laid the foundation for all later episcopal tyranny.⁹⁶⁹ Constantine's '*Reformation*' followed 'the gorgeous solemnities of *Paganisme*',⁹⁷⁰ but 'the love of holy Reformation' followed only the Scriptures.⁹⁷¹ Episcopacy, together with the rituals, feasts, and fasts enjoined by the English and Scottish Books of Common Prayer had no place in such a reformation. The second book of Milton's treatise was a long argument against episcopacy. Denying James VI and I's conjoining of episcopacy and monarchy,⁹⁷² Milton sought to show that far from being of benefit, bishops were a consistent threat to the state.⁹⁷³ Milton's last words were truly damning; bishops were '*down-trodden Vessels of Perdition*'.⁹⁷⁴

Parliament had a similar view on 15 June 1641, when Thomas Ford called for a new Josiah, 'a very reforming Prince' who 'had a right spirit in way of Reformation'.⁹⁷⁵ The Josiah in question was not a new Edward VI. Ford, like Milton, saw Edward's reformation as a betrayal, for 'the issue gave in evidence that the generality were but meere Formalists in that reformation, and did but waite for a wind, to carry them to *Rome* againe'.⁹⁷⁶ Perhaps this was a reference to Northumberland's scaffold proclamation, but other statements in the sermon seem to indict the

⁹⁶⁶ John Milton, *Of Reformation* (London, 1641). For Henry VIII, see pp. 8 – 9; for Edward VI, see pp. 9 – 10; for Mary see p. 10; for Elizabeth, see pp. 15 – 16.

⁹⁶⁷ Milton, *Of Reformation*, pp. 6 – 7 (on Wyclif), 12 (on Cranmer).

⁹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 16.

⁹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 24; see also pp. 48 – 53.

⁹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁹⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 44, 47.

⁹⁷³ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 51 – 3.

⁹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁹⁷⁵ Thomas Ford, *Reformation Sure and Stedfast* (London, 1641), p. 3.

⁹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Book of Common Prayer. Early on, Ford made the passing remark that ceremonies were ‘no substantiall point’ of sound devotion.⁹⁷⁷ Near the end of his sermon, he stated that the history from Elizabeth through Charles revealed ‘the hearts of the people were prepared for that Reformation of Religion’, but ‘from perfection in Reformation, we have beene often stopped.’⁹⁷⁸ The major threat came from ‘Idolaters’ and ‘popish spirits’, the latter of whom Ford believed were especially active in his own day.⁹⁷⁹ Ford said nothing explicit about episcopacy, although he later supported Presbyterianism. Diverse solutions were offered to the problem of church order. Some wanted a national Presbyterian church while others wanted ‘Independencie’ or congregational autonomy. Although these groups were united in their opposition to bishops, they were just as opposed to one another. In terms of religion, three clearly-defined groups existed in England. Catholics were a fourth group but were primarily concentrated in Ireland. The civil wars were not simply between two sides, despite the political conflict being portrayed as an opposition between Parliament and the king.

The English Parliament split over the course of 1643, with most of the Lords joining the king at Oxford; the Commons largely remained in London, meaning that from 1643 on, the group that legislated in the name of Parliament was really just a rump of the whole. The severing of Lords from Commons enabled the latter to proceed apace with its own plans for religious reformation, which were given a new point of focus when it created the Westminster Assembly. From its very inception, the Westminster Assembly set forth a new line of historical argument that looked upon the religious developments of the mid-sixteenth century as the beginning, but not the completion, of reformation. Charles I had refused to grant Royal Assent to the creation of the Assembly in 1642, but Parliament, describing its decision as ‘a further & more perfect work

⁹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 6.

⁹⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

⁹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 20.

of Reformation, then yet hath bin attained', proceeded with its plans and passed an ordinance on 12 June 1643 that called the Westminster Assembly into being.⁹⁸⁰ One of the Assembly's first acts was its ratification of *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion*, a text composed by Scottish Covenanters and members of the House of Commons. Recent Scottish themes could be seen in the covenant's emphasis upon 'preservation', and just as 'preservation' and 'reformation' were synonymous in the National Covenant and related publications, the two words were joined together when applied to the other Stuart kingdoms. The authors of *A Solemn League and Covenant* called for 'the preservation of the Reformed Religion in the Church of *Scotland*' and 'the reformation of Religion in the Kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland*'.⁹⁸¹ *A Solemn League and Covenant* sought to impose one version of Scottish religion—Presbyterianism—upon the entirety of the British Isles, and its authors believed that this would bolster the 'Common cause of Religion, Liberty, and Peace of the Kingdomes'.⁹⁸² The Covenant therefore sought to impose the simplest of bifurcations upon what was really a diverse religious and political situation.

The Westminster Assembly also created *A Directory for the Public Worship of God*, which was intended to replace the Book of Common Prayer. In their preface, the authors sketched a broad historical portrait of liturgical reform since the mid-sixteenth century.

In the beginning of the blessed Reformation, our wise and pious Ancestors took care to set forth an Order for Redresse of many things, which they, then, by the Word discovered to be Vain, Erroneous, Superstitious, and Idolatrous, in the Publique Worship of God.

This occasioned many Godly and Learned men to rejoyce much in the Book of Common-

⁹⁸⁰ The Parliament of England and Wales, *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons...For the Calling of an Assembly of Learned, and Godly Divines* (London, 1643), p. 1.

⁹⁸¹ Westminster Assembly, *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion* (Edinburgh, 1643), p. 4.

⁹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Prayer at that time set forth; Because the Masse, and the rest of the Latine-Service being removed, the Publique Worship was celebrated in our own Tongue; many of the common People also received benefit by hearing the Scriptures read in their own Language, which formerly were unto them as a Book that is sealed.⁹⁸³

This wholly inverted the appeal to the sixteenth century made by the 1637 Book of Common Prayer, which treated mid-sixteenth religious change as complete rather than unfinished. The Preface of the Directory then explained that despite these changes, the English liturgy composed under Edward VI, with its ‘many unprofitable and burdensome Ceremonies’, had caused offense not only to ‘the Godly at home; but also to the Reformed Churches abroad.’⁹⁸⁴ The Prayer Book was to be rejected and a new form of service was to take its place. In an important aside that sought to claim Tudor liturgical reform as the forerunner of the *Public Directory*, the preface asserted that the ‘first Reformers’, if they were still alive, ‘would joyn with us in this work’.⁹⁸⁵ The new order of service was described as a ‘further Reformation’,⁹⁸⁶ a designation indicating that the authors of the *Public Directory* had come to conceive of an earlier, if incomplete, sixteenth-century reformation.

Against the Commons’ reformation was a continuing argument for the authority of the king and thus his exclusive right to lead the way in reformation. In a letter written to the General Assembly of Scotland on 23 July 1642, Charles I promised, ‘We will endeavor a Reformation in a fair and orderly way, and where a Reformation is settled, We resolve with that authority wherewith God hath vested Us, to maintain and defend it in Peace and Libertie, against all trouble that can come without, and against all Heresie, Sects, and Schismes, which may arise

⁹⁸³ Westminster Assembly, *A Directory for the Public Worship of God* (London, 1644), pp. 1 – 2.

⁹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 2.

⁹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 6.

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid.

from within'.⁹⁸⁷ The king was willing to negotiate, at least up to a point, but the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant fundamentally shifted the state of debate from 1643 on. Protests against it were widespread, and variously described it as impious, unlawful, and treasonous.⁹⁸⁸ In the words of Charles I, it was 'in Truth nothing else but a Trayterous and Seditious Combination against Vs, and against the established Religion and Lawes of this Kingdome'.⁹⁸⁹ As in earlier rebellions, the opponents of the king were seen as traitors, and the Solemn League and Covenant's vision of reformation was guilty by association. Writing from Oxford to a friend at Cambridge, the clergyman Henry Ferne published a public letter against the Covenant, noting that everyone who took it 'doth in conscience allow and approve the Scots Discipline and Government, and withall binds himselfe to endeavor the advancement of the same, by bringing this Kingdome to an Uniformity with them.'⁹⁹⁰ Ferne believed that by seeking 'the extirpation of Episcopacie', supporters of the Covenant imposed a simple but false bifurcation upon the troubled political state of the British kingdoms: 'That he doth in conscience account and esteeme those that adhere to the King (for those are there meant by them that require the Covenant) to be Indendiaries [sic], Malignants, and common Enemies'.⁹⁹¹ Most simply stated, Covenanters and their supporters sought 'by force of Armes to compel the King to the Reformation pretended herein'.⁹⁹² A civil war, a holy war, a rebellion—to its opponents, the Covenant justified each of these.

⁹⁸⁷ Charles I, *A True Copy of His Maiesties Letter* (London, 1642), p. 4.

⁹⁸⁸ See, e.g., Anonymous, *A Briefe Discovrse, Declaring the Impiety and Unlawfulnessse of the Covenant with the Scots* (London, 1643); Anonymous, *The Iniquity of the Late Solemn League* (London, 1643); Supreme Council of Confederate Catholics, *Admonitions by the Sypream Covncell of the Confederat Catholicks of Ireland* (Waterford, 1643).

⁹⁸⁹ Charles I, *Proclamation Forbidding the Tendering or Taking of a Late Covenant, Called, A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation* (Oxford, 1643).

⁹⁹⁰ Henry Ferne, *The Unlawfulnessse of the New Covenant* (Oxford, 1643), pp. 1 – 2.

⁹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 2.

⁹⁹² Ibid., p. 3.

Rejecting the Solemn League and Covenant soon enough carried penalties. On 1 May 1647, Parliament passed an Ordinance ‘for the Visitation and Reformation of the University of Oxford, and the Severall Colledges and Halls therein.’⁹⁹³ Oxford, as a royalist and episcopalian stronghold, had refused the Solemn League and Covenant. Like Oxford, Cambridge had also rallied for the king, but Oliver Cromwell prevented it from aiding the royalist cause. A series of purges took place at Cambridge in the mid-1640s, and the *Solemn League and Covenant* was imposed as a test of religious and political orthodoxy at the university.⁹⁹⁴ Parliament’s intended reformation of Oxford sought to recreate it along similar lines. The 1647 Ordinance specified that the masters, scholars, fellows, and officers of the university were to publicly assent to the *Solemn League and Covenant*,⁹⁹⁵ and those appointed as visitors to Oxford included Presbyterian stalwarts such as William Prynne. In 1648, the Committee for Reformation of the Universities was formed in order to oversee the reformation of both institutions. Oxford did not accept these determinations, and this too led to a further series of purges at the university in 1648 and 1649.⁹⁹⁶ The norms guiding the reformation of the universities were consistently doctrinal, but the same standards were idiosyncratically enforced, particularly when academic communities found themselves confronted by visions of reformation more extensive than they were prepared to accommodate. At both Cambridge and Oxford, domestic enrollment declined significantly after their reformation.⁹⁹⁷ Other attempts at reform, such as rejecting the use of caps and gowns because of their ostensible ties to Catholic ceremony, were also proposed—but rarely without

⁹⁹³ For general background, see Blair Worden, ‘Cromwellian Oxford’, in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 733 – 772; Christopher Brooke, ‘Cambridge in the Age of the Puritan Revolution’, in Victor Morgan, with Christopher Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge, Vol. II: 1546 – 1750* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 464 – 482.

⁹⁹⁴ Brooke, ‘Cambridge in the Age of the Puritan Revolution’, p. 469.

⁹⁹⁵ The Parliament of England and Wales, *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. For the Visitation and Reformation of the University of Oxford and the Severall Colledges and Halls therein* (London, 1647), p. 3 (mispag. as p. 5)

⁹⁹⁶ Worden, ‘Cromwellian Oxford’, p. 733.

⁹⁹⁷ Brooke, ‘Cambridge and the Puritan Revolution’, p. 467; Worden, ‘Cromwellian Oxford’, p. 750.

controversy, and just as often without success.⁹⁹⁸ As in the wider nation, the reformation of the universities brought forth only bitter fruit.

The weeks leading up to the king's execution exemplified the king's contention that reformation was just a pretense for rebellion. On 6 December 1648, colonel Thomas Pride led a military takeover of the House of Commons, an event subsequently known as 'Pride's Purge'. All members suspected of sympathizing with the king were either arrested or prevented from sitting; in protest, other members of the Commons refused to take their seats, with the end result that less than half of the Commons remained. Because of their remarkably reduced number, those who continued to sit were subsequently known as the 'Rump' parliament. Under the guidance of the military junta, the Rump created a commission to judge whether or not the king was guilty of high treason. Throughout his trial, Charles was defiant and he completely rejected the claim that a portion of the Commons had the right to try and convict him. Despite failing to secure a legitimate verdict even by its own standards—many of its commissioners refused to participate, and only 57 of its 135 members signed the king's death warrant—the anti-monarchical wing of the Rump nonetheless succeeded in having the king executed.⁹⁹⁹

The last word against reformation nonetheless belonged to Charles I. On the day of the king's execution, the royalist printer Richard Royston released the king's autobiographical work *Eikon Basilike*. It proved wildly popular; thirty-nine editions were printed in 1649 and dozens more were printed in England and abroad through the end of the century, making it the most published book in seventeenth-century England.¹⁰⁰⁰ Arranged as a series of reflections on recent political events, each of which concluded with a prayer, *Eikon Basilike* functioned as both a

⁹⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 745.

⁹⁹⁹ Helpful overviews of Charles I's execution may be found in Cust, *Charles I*, pp. 452 – 65; Howard Nenner, 'Regicides (act. 1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/70599>, accessed 6 Dec 2014].

¹⁰⁰⁰ Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Boydell, 2003), p. 81.

political exposé and a religious devotional. Its twenty-eight sections were punctuated with references to—and, more importantly, arguments against—reformation. The first section of *Eikon Basilike* went on the offensive as Charles sounded the alarm against the bad faith his opponents: ‘No man having a greater zeal to see Religion settled, and preserved in Truth, Unity, and Order, than My self; whom it most concerns both in piety, and policy; as knowing, that, No flames of civil dissensions are more dangerous than those which make Religious pretensions the grounds of Factions.’¹⁰⁰¹ Political factions opposed reason, their members only pretended to be Protestants, and driven by a ‘superstitious sourness’ the king’s opponents advocated false reform.¹⁰⁰² Time and again, Charles described ‘reformation’ in a negative fashion. Those who wrote against the doctrine and discipline of the English church were ‘gilded with shows of Zeal and Reformation’, and their innovations were ‘masked under the name of Reformation’.¹⁰⁰³ Here was the suspicion of Whitgift, Bancroft, and Hooker. *Eikon Basilike* was, like so much of the other controversial literature published in the 1640s, a recapitulation of older arguments.

The primary meaning of ‘reformation’ was far from positive in the king’s book, but a secondary meaning was also present in its pages. The twentieth section of *Eikon Basilike*, entitled ‘Upon the Reformations of the Times’, began with the classic contrast between reformed and deformed. ‘No Glory is more to be envied than that, of due Reforming either Church or State, when deformities are such, that the perturbation and novelty are not like to exceed the benefit of Reforming.’¹⁰⁰⁴ Moderation, counsel, and Christian charity defined true reformation. Disorder, especially in the form of iconoclasm, was antithetical to the wellbeing of both church and state, ‘since they leave all things more deformed, disorderly, and discontented, than when they began,

¹⁰⁰¹ Charles I, *Eikon Basilike*, p. 52.

¹⁰⁰² Ibid., pp. 72, 73, 78.

¹⁰⁰³ Ibid., pp. 98, 99.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 155.

in point of Piety, Morality, Charity, and good Order.¹⁰⁰⁵ Such words offer no reason to believe that Charles was either fundamentally or ideologically opposed to religious or political change. Order and its attendant goods were simply paramount necessities. The tragic outcome of the king's trial was a clear sign that his opponents did not share his governing convictions. *Eikon Basilike* thus bequeathed a hermeneutic of suspicion to those who supported the king during the civil wars. Among those who lamented the state of England after his death—a death widely portrayed as martyrdom—this same hermeneutic was retained and even nurtured. In *Eikon Basilike*, a genuinely Christian reformation could only be monarchical, episcopal, and liturgical. The king's execution on 30 January 1648/9 revealed that royal reformation was fundamentally incompatible with the reformations of his opponents.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 157; Charles prays for 'Christian and charitable Reformation' on p. 159.

Chapter Five

‘These Times of Reformation’:¹⁰⁰⁶ Discourses of Reformation in the 1650s

Come we now to the saddest difference that ever happened in the *Church of England*, if we consider either the time how long it continued, the eminent persons therein engaged, or the dolefull effects thereby produced. It was about *matters of conformity*. Alas! that men should have lesse wisdome than locusts; which, when sent on God's errand, *Did not *thrust one another*: whereas here such shoving, and shouldring; and hoising, and heavings, and justleing, and thronging, betwixt Clergie-men of the highest parts, and places. For now nonconformity in the daies of King *Edward* was conceived, which afterward in the Reign of Queen *Mary* (but beyond Sea at *Frankford*) was born; which in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* was nursed, and weaned; which under King *James* grew up a young youth, or tall stripling; but towards the end of King *Charles* His Reign, shot up to the full strength, and stature of a man, able, not onely to coap with, but conquer the Herarchie its adversary.

- Thomas Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain*, p. 401 n. 23¹⁰⁰⁷

I.

The execution of Charles I added new layers of complexity to the long-standing debates about reformation. Supporting the newly ascendant revolutionary regime, John Milton wrote *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* in justification of the regicide. Milton's politics should not be allowed to overshadow his use of traditional political assumptions. Comparing his argument with that of Charles in *Eikon Basilike* reveals that both authors worked out of a shared set of values. Each appealed to the rule of law. In section 27 of *Eikon Basilike*, which was addressed to Charles II, the late king advised, 'I cannot yet learn that lesson, nor I hope ever will you, That it is safe for a King to gratify any Faction with the perturbation of the Laws, in which is wrapped up the public Interest, and the good of the Community.'¹⁰⁰⁸ Milton wrote similarly and argued that law always transcended the self-interest of kings and magistrates, a conviction that he justified quite

¹⁰⁰⁶ Anonymous, *Lillyes Lamentations* (London, 1652), p. 5.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Thomas Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain* (London, 1655). The marginal note of this paragraph reads, 'The conception of non-conformity.' The * refers to Joel 2:8.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Charles I, *Eikon Basilike*, edited by Jim Daems and Holly Faith Nelson (Broadview Editions, 2006), p. 188.

traditionally by drawing upon Aristotle's notion of the common good.¹⁰⁰⁹ Furthermore, Milton followed Aristotle and defined a tyrant as one who 'regarding neither Law nor the common good, reigns onely for himself and his faction'.¹⁰¹⁰ Such had been the king's own sentiments in addressing his son.

Milton did not actually state the Rump's charges against the king, but in defending recent events, he made an important distinction between rebellion and self-defense. Like others before him, Milton held that tyranny was beyond the legal pale. His most important authority was the Bible. Turning to the Old Testament book of Judges, he followed a line of argument as old as John Ponet, and argued that the Israelites had a tradition of 'tyrant-killing'. Milton also appealed to the story of Ehud, explaining Ehud's actions by claiming that the biblical hero had both 'the knowledge of true Religion' and a 'special warrant from God' for his actions.¹⁰¹¹ Milton's assumptions about Ehud may have come from Ponet, but his language reflects the Geneva Bible. In its introduction to the book of Judges, the Geneva Bible emphasized two points as worthy of note: 'first, the battel that the Church of God hathe for maintenance of true religion against idolatrie and superstition: next, what great danger the commune wealth is in, when as God giueth not a magistrate to reteine his people in the purenes of religion and his true seruice.'¹⁰¹² If Ehud was justified in the 'battel' for 'true religion against idolatrie and superstition', Milton reasoned that he and his associates were as well.

Although the *Tenure* underscored the political divisions between the supporters of Charles I and their opponents, it also highlighted the theological differences between Presbyterians and Independents. The attempted reformations of the 1640s drew these into the

¹⁰⁰⁹ John Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (London, 1649), 10 – 11.

¹⁰¹⁰ Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁰¹¹ Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁰¹² The Geneva Bible (Geneva, 1560; STC 2093), The Old Testament, fol. 108.

open, and under political strain these divides deepened during the 1650s. Milton was an Independent, and his work opened with an attack upon Presbyterian divines, whom he described as Janus-faced.¹⁰¹³ Like so many others during the previous half-century, Milton looked north of the border to better understand England's own recent history. The *Tenure* offered a very simple but powerful historical argument: the regicide of Charles I was no different than what Scottish Presbyterians had accomplished the previous century. According to Milton, regicide and rebellion were central Protestant tenets. About halfway through his text, Milton began a select role call of historical events that he described as 'all Protestant and chiefly Presbyterian.'¹⁰¹⁴ Only the first of these, which related the rebellion of the Lutheran princes against Emperor Charles V in 1546, did not come from Presbyterian history. The most important figure for Milton was John Knox, 'a most famous Divine and the reformer of *Scotland* to the Presbyterian discipline'.¹⁰¹⁵ Milton noted that in 1564, Knox led the rebellion against Mary's rule, and having come to the conclusion that she was a tyrant, he and his supporters sought to 'reform all things according to the original institution of Common-welths.'¹⁰¹⁶ Milton's key charge against his Presbyterian contemporaries lay precisely here: 'And to let the world know that the whole Church and Protestant State of *Scotland* in those purest times of reformation were of the same beleaf, three years after, they met in the feild *Mary* thir lawful and hereditary Queen, took her prisoner yeilding before fight, kept her in prison, and the same yeare depos'd her.'¹⁰¹⁷ As if this were not enough, Milton concluded this line of discussion with an accusation of hypocrisy. 'But what need these examples to Presbyterians, I mean to those who now of late would seem so much to abhorr deposing, when as they to all Christendom have giv'n the latest and the liveliest

¹⁰¹³ Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, p. 6.

¹⁰¹⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁰¹⁵ Ibid., p. 29.

¹⁰¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁷ Ibid., p. 30.

example of doing it themselves.’¹⁰¹⁸ Presbyterian support for Charles I, like Presbyterian loyalty to his son, was not merely capitulation but a refusal of Presbyterianism’s own first principles. Milton connected sixteenth-century Scotland to seventeenth-century England by asserting that reformation and revolt necessarily walked hand in hand.

Milton’s sentiments were powerful but far from popular. Many refused to associate ‘those purest times of reformation’ with rationalizations for civil war; a number of publications instead communicated raw outrage at the regicide, as their authors set about defending the late king and his church. A good example of such stubborn determination can be seen in the anonymously authored pamphlet *Women Will Have Their Will, Or Give Christmas His Due*, a fictional dialogue between the characters M^{rs} Custome and M^{rs} New-Come. The latter is described as ‘living in *Reformation-Alley*, neer *Destruction-Street*’, while the former is portrayed as a pious Christian who devoutly celebrates Christmas.¹⁰¹⁹ Early in the text, Custome complains that Christmas and Reformation are set against one another as diametrical opposites: ‘now forsooth these Reformado’s, upon pretence of Reformation, shall destroy and overthrow the most Famous and Commendable Customes of this Land; especially for the observing and keeping of this Great Day’.¹⁰²⁰ New-Come rejects this argument, and the characters argue with one another for the next nine pages before the work defiantly concludes. New-Come threatens Custome with retaliation by the Army, but Custome responds, ‘Devill, doe thy worst; if they are honest men they will not doe it’.¹⁰²¹ The final page of the pamphlet is a poem that defends Christmas. According to *Women Will Have Their Will*, reformation had brought the nation into a devotional no-man’s land.

¹⁰¹⁸ Ibid, p. 32.

¹⁰¹⁹ Anonymous, *Women Will Have Their Will, Or Give Christmas His Due* (London, 1649).

¹⁰²⁰ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁰²¹ Ibid., p. 15.

Another anonymously authored pamphlet took this same line of defense and linked it with heresiology and its attendant fears of political anarchy. Entitled *Newes From Powles, Or the New Reformation of the Army*, it recounted an instance of sacrilege by the New Model Army officer Hugh Peters, who had baptized a colt in St. Paul's London. The author portrayed the mock baptism as the most scandalous act in a much larger catalogue of sacrilegious exploits. The tract began, however, with a rhetorical question:

Have we not a blessed *Reformation* indeed, and a sound Religion established, when Horses goe to Church, and Lectures of Treason, Warre and discord are read instead of the Gospel of PEACE and Glad tidings of Salvation, where Warres Horn-book is taught in stead of holy Scripture, and the blessed Sacrament of Baptisme of no more esteem then a mock to christen beasts; Is not this the *Desolation of Abomination* in the Holy Place?¹⁰²²

Newes from Powles purported to contain a transcript of the service that then took place. The *faux* liturgy inverted the baptismal rite found in the Book of Common Prayer by working its traditional content around more recent political questions. In place of the customary affirmations of Christian faith, those appointed to imitate the godparents were instead asked to affirm their belief that Charles I was guilty for the civil wars, that all bishops 'deserve hanging', and that the Church of England 'is not the Communion of Saints, but the Synagogue of Satan'.¹⁰²³ The zero-sum content of these questions was met with an equally zero-sum response by the author of the *Newes*, who described Peters as a 'Blasphemous Roague'.¹⁰²⁴ These anonymous pamphleteers

¹⁰²² Anonymous, *Newes from Powles, Or the New Reformation of the Army* (London, 1649), p. 3; 'the Desolation of Abomination' is a reference to the Biblical book of Daniel (9:27, 11:31, and 12:11). The phrase can also be found in the New Testament (Matt. 24:15 – 16, Mark 13:14, and Luke 21:20 – 21), and similar references can be found in the apocryphal/deuterocanonical book I Maccabees (1:54, 6:7). In all instances, it refers to the profanation of the Temple in Jerusalem.

¹⁰²³ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁰²⁴ Ibid.

and their sympathizers opposed reformation as the necessary consequent of their defenses of Christmas, baptism, and other religious customs.

The content of such *apologia* easily shaded into debates surrounding Charles I's *Eikon Basilike*. Like both Presbyterians and Independents, Charles conceived of reformation as inseparable from ecclesiastical polity, but his own vision of the English church sought to preserve those liturgical and hierarchical elements that his opponents so detested. In the months following his regicide, both poetry and sermons took Charles' arguments and extended them in various ways, in the process transforming the *Eikon* into a theopolitical tractate of immense influence and versatility. One early text, Henry King's *An Elegy Upon the most Incomparable K. Charls the I*, complained against Parliament as 'ye cursed Mountebanks of State, / Who have *Eight years* for Reformation sate'.¹⁰²⁵ The king's Parliamentary enemies were further described as a 'wild Faction' and a 'graceless Junto', collectively guilty of 'bold Examples of Impiety'.¹⁰²⁶ Like many works of the time, whether apologetic or polemical, typology was a key form of argument, and King's *Elegy* was no exception. Royalists often viewed and portrayed Charles as a second Christ, a typological image that they complimented by casting Charles' enemies as the antitype of Jesus' Jewish enemies—in King's case, Judas Iscariot, who betrayed Jesus for thirty pieces of silver. As King piled on his accusations, he returned to his earlier theme. 'Brave *Reformation!* And a through one too, / Which to enrich Your selves must All undo.'¹⁰²⁷ Just as Jesus was handed over, so was Charles, and the pattern of Judas in first-century Jerusalem was typologically reenacted in seventeenth-century England:

For doubtlesse They (Good men) had never sold,

But that you tempted Them with English Gold;

¹⁰²⁵ Henry King, *An Elegy Upon the most Incomparable K. Charls the I* (London, n.d.), p. 5.

¹⁰²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5, 6, 9.

¹⁰²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

And 'tis no wonder if with such a Sum
Our Brethrens frailty might be overcome.
What though hereafter it may prove Their Lot
To be compared with *Iscaiot*?¹⁰²⁸

In the *Elegy*, reformation connoted both blood money and bloodguilt. Pro-Caroline sermons were thematically much the same, preaching against reformation and Parliament's usurpation while drawing typological comparisons between the beheading of Charles and the crucifixion of Jesus.¹⁰²⁹ Whether through rhyming couplets or sermonic prose, authors such as Henry King protested in terms equally sweeping and impassioned.

For still others, debate about reformation necessitated debate about the organization of the visible church. Presbyterians and Independents saw reformation as a necessary duty and the present moment as its most viable opportunity, but they articulated fundamentally different visions of how English Christianity should be structured. These divergences cut across any and all local boundaries. Days after the king's death, Presbyterians in Lancaster composed *A Solemn Exhortation*, which encouraged the full adoption of the Presbyterian system at both local and provincial levels throughout England. The authors' aim was to finally create a national Presbyterian hierarchy, which would ensure that no congregation in England was left without their particular form of ecclesiastical discipline. Claiming that Christ had instituted Presbyterian order, the Lancaster Presbyterians also claimed that it had been 'lately restored to the hands of those his Officers unto whom he himself [Christ] committed it'.¹⁰³⁰ Despite being restored, they continued, Presbyterianism had also been undermined by other forms of ecclesiastical

¹⁰²⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁰²⁹ See, e.g., Richard Watson, *Regicidium Jvdaicum* (The Hague, 1649), esp. p. 23 (citing Charles' arguments against reformation in the *Eikon*); more generally, see Henry Leslie, *The Martyrdome of King Charles* (The Hague and London, 1649).

¹⁰³⁰ Anonymous, *A Solemn Exhortation* (London, 1649), p. 3.

discipline—namely, Independent or Congregationalist order. The petitioners alleged that those who opposed the Presbyterian way were bound not only by ‘a common hatred to Reformation’, but by their ‘expectation and endeavors for a legal Toleration, and an assuming of liberty in Religion for the present, the fruitful mother of all Atheism, Error, false Religion, and Profaneness’.¹⁰³¹ The Presbyterians of Lancaster concluded by calling the nation to ‘stand fast to our solemn League and Covenant’.¹⁰³² As in 1643 when it was first adopted, supporters of the *Solemn League and Covenant* heralded it as the only trustworthy means for attaining reformation in the last weeks of 1648. But as in the early 1640s, Presbyterian ecclesiology proved to be just one of several options available at the end of the decade. The successively short-lived political regimes of the Interregnum gave no place to episcopacy, but in refusing to commit to a national Presbyterian church structure, these same regimes undermined their own ability to secure any kind of national consensus on religious matters.

Far to the south east of Lancaster, in an attempt to preserve congregational autonomy against Presbyterian petitioning, the Northamptonshire minister Richard Resbury published *The Tabernacle of God with Men: Or, the Visible Church Reformed* in 1649. Given its contents, Resbury could very well have written his work in response to *A Solemn Exhortation*, although he indicated no such concern. Like practically everyone else, Resbury was also deeply committed to the visible church, but he opposed any kind of hierarchical ordering beyond the individual local congregation. He organized his *Tabernacle of God* around eight arguments. The first asserted, ‘The true matter of the visible Church is visible Saints onely’, while the second affirmed, ‘Discipline is an Ordinance of Christ, for ordering the visible Church in her Several

¹⁰³¹ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁰³² Ibid., p. 16.

Congregations'.¹⁰³³ Each particular congregation was the *locus primus* of the visible church, and this belief defined all Independent/Congregationalist ecclesiology. According to Resbury, parochial autonomy took precedence over anything else that Christians might share, including baptism and the Lord's Supper. He advised, 'In the Reformed Churches, when any member of one Congregation transplants to another, notwithstanding he hath received the Supper formerly in the Church whence he came, yet doth the church to which he is come, examine and approve him for knowledge and conversation, before they receive him to the Supper.'¹⁰³⁴ However, in *A Solemn Exhortation*, the Presbyterians in Lancaster had explicitly protested against this same approach. No one, they claimed, had the right to 'murmur against certain of the Communicants, in the several Congregations, as if they were visibly unworthy of the Lords Supper'.¹⁰³⁵ They argued that exclusion from the sacrament should only occur after 'an orderly complaint, prosecution, and proof' within the Presbyterian synod.¹⁰³⁶ Although not wholly identical to the older system of church courts, due process was the *sine qua non* in both Anglican and Presbyterian enforcements of ecclesiastical discipline. Because Congregationalism refused the creation of a structure that would enable such a procedure, each individual believer was at the mercy of each individual church.

Although Congregationalists and Presbyterians were united in their rejection of episcopacy, they were divided over what should take its place. Incompatible understandings of reformation proved the cornerstone of division. In uncompromising terms, Resbury averred, 'The true way of Reformation amongst us, in this; that persons fit matter of the Church, joyne together in Church fellowship, chuse Officers with cautions formerly laid down, and so forme

¹⁰³³ Richard Resbury, *The Tabernacle of God with Men: Or, the Visible Church Reformed* (London, 1649), sig. A3; further discussions of the visible church can be found on, e.g., pp. 6 and 22.

¹⁰³⁴ Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁰³⁵ Anonymous, *A Solemn Exhortation*, p. 11.

¹⁰³⁶ Ibid.

Congregations into a disciplinary State, exercising discipline among themselves, leaving out the rest.’¹⁰³⁷ After the autonomy of each church was attained, some churches might choose to work with other churches, but no one had the right to order such relations from the outset. Any such attempt was, from Resbury’s point of view, a false reformation. In this, he was not alone; a decade later, three earlier key works of Independent thought—*The Apologetical Narration* (1643), *The Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren* (1644), and the Savoy Confession (1658)—were published together as *Reformation Or, The Progress thereof in Some Foot-steps of it in The Congregational way of Churches in England, From the Year of our Lord, 1640*.¹⁰³⁸ For Independents, reformation had begun in 1640, and it was as uncompromising, particular, and all encompassing as that envisioned by Presbyterians.

On 16 December 1653, continued opposition to the Church of England was given constitutional standing through *The Government of the Common-Wealth*, also known as the *Instrument of Government*.¹⁰³⁹ A series of articles concerned with religion appeared at the end of the document. Because the first of these opened with a call for religious unity, and because the second explicitly eschewed religious coercion, it is easy to miss the extensive limitations that the third article placed upon a significant portion of the English population. Religious liberty was promised to all who ‘profess Faith in God by Jesus Christ’ so long as ‘they abuse not this Liberty, to the civil Injury of others, and to the actual Disturbance of the Publick Peace’, but the article concluded with an important qualifying clause: ‘this Liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as (under the profession of Christ) hold forth and practise

¹⁰³⁷ Resbury, *The Tabernacle of God with Men*, p. 45.

¹⁰³⁸ Anonymous, *Reformation Or, The Progress thereof in Some Foot-steps of it in The Congregational way of Churches in England, From the Year of our Lord, 1640* (London, 1659).

¹⁰³⁹ Oliver Cromwell, *The Government of the Common-Wealth* (London, 1654).

Licentiousness.’¹⁰⁴⁰ Catholics comprised less than two percent of the English population, but those who favored ‘Prelacy’—the episcopalianism of the Church of England—were much larger in number. Denying them freedom from religious coercion meant that an immense amount of religious exclusion was legally tolerated under Oliver Cromwell. The Cromwellian Protectorate is often portrayed as confessionally tolerant because of its minimalist theological criteria,¹⁰⁴¹ but to borrow from Blair Worden, ‘The religious policy of Oliver Cromwell becomes much clearer when we see it as a search not for the toleration for which he is so often commended, but for union: for the unity of the godly party’.¹⁰⁴² The *Instrument* allowed Presbyterians and Independents to each pursue their own respective reformations within an oligarchic confessional framework. Those who opposed either reformation were subject to legal reprisals and exclusion from the government.

II.

The mid-1650s saw a surge of writing concerned with Tudor ecclesiastical history. Apologists for the Church of England transformed ‘reformation’ into a proper noun variously termed ‘the English Reformation’ and ‘our Reformation’. The first such work was published in 1653 and entitled *The Way of Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified*. As with a number of other similar works in the early 1650s, the author was unidentified on its title page. Only in 1657, when two revised and much-expanded editions of this same work were

¹⁰⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 17 – 18, n. XXXVII.

¹⁰⁴¹ See, e.g., Barry Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 40; Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Boydell Press, 2003), p. 57; Andrew Bradstock, *Radical Religion in Cromwell’s England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth* (I. B. Tauris, 2011), p. xiii.

¹⁰⁴² Blair Worden, ‘Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate’, in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *Persecution and Toleration* (Basil Blackwell, 1984), pp. 199 – 246, p. 210.

published, did the author reveal himself as Peter Heylyn.¹⁰⁴³ Heylyn was among the first Anglican apologists to transform Nonconformist calls for reformation of the English church into a historical discourse about the sixteenth century. He began doing this as early as 1637, when he published *A Briefe and Moderate Answer*, an attack on two Gunpowder Treason sermons delivered by Henry Burton the previous year. Like John Milton after him, Burton had argued that the bishops were enemies of the king; accused of sedition, Burton was found guilty and imprisoned—but not before he managed to publish his sermons and a defense of them.¹⁰⁴⁴ Heylyn was, in his own words, ‘commanded by authority to returne an Answer to all the challenges and charges, in the said two Sermons and Apology of Master Burton.’¹⁰⁴⁵ However, despite the impetus for his volume, Heylyn identified his work as a response to both Catholic and Nonconformist opponents of the Church of England. Addressing Catholics, he asserted, ‘in the reformation of this Church, we introduced no novelties into the same’. Addressing Burton and his sympathizers, Heylyn averred, ‘all those Innovations which they have charged upon the Church in their scandalous Pamphlets, are but a restitution of those ancient orders, which were established here at that Reformation.’¹⁰⁴⁶ However, unlike his later writings, in 1637 Heylyn portrayed the Reformation as a distinctly Elizabethan event.¹⁰⁴⁷

As Heylyn told the story in 1637, Elizabeth’s reformation was tied to earlier legal and religious developments, particularly the religious changes that took place under Edward VI.¹⁰⁴⁸ In one instance, he described these in passing as ‘the first reformation of religion’.¹⁰⁴⁹ Perhaps he

¹⁰⁴³ The 1657 edition was also slightly retitled as *The Way and Manner of the Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified*.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Kenneth Gibson, ‘Burton, Henry (bap. 1578, d. 1647/8)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4129>, accessed 3 Dec 2014].

¹⁰⁴⁵ Peter Heylyn, *A Briefe and Moderate Answer* (London, 1637; STC 13269), sig. dv.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Ibid., sig. dr – v.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 50 – 1, 135, 140 – 1.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Ibid., e.g., pp. 138, 148, 157 – 8, 168 (mispag. as 166).

¹⁰⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 78.

did not elaborate on the matter because he, like so many of his contemporaries, saw the Edwardian regime as driven by greed. In this, he was no different than John Hayward, whose second edition of *The Life and Reigne of King Edward the Sixth* had just been published in 1636. Heylyn summarized Edwardian history as follows: ‘the case stood thus. King *Edward* being a *Minor* about nine yeares old, at his first coming to the crowne; there was much heaving at the Church, by some great men which were about him, who purposed to inrich themselves with the spoyles thereof.’¹⁰⁵⁰ Whatever the reality of spoliation under Elizabeth, and whatever its motivation, her reign produced nothing comparable to such a chaotic event as the overthrow of Edward Seymour, the Duke of Somerset; nor did her regime witness anything akin to the attempt of John Dudley, the Duke of Northumberland, to enthrone his daughter-in-law Jane. Consequently, Elizabeth’s regime bequeathed no comparable memory of betrayal in political or religious matters to later generations. Rather, her reformation appeared to Heylyn and his contemporaries as ideal. Well aware of his apologetic commission in 1637, Heylyn used the Elizabethan record to dismiss accusations of religious novelty during the reign of Charles I. Addressing Burton, Heylyn defended the ceremonial practices disliked by Caroline-era Nonconformists: ‘we have found no novelty, nothing that tends to Innovation in the worship of God but a reviver and continuance onely of the ancient usages which have beene practiced in this Church since the reformation, and were commended to it from the purest ages.’¹⁰⁵¹ In Heylyn’s hands, reformation was synonymous with conservation.

Between 1637 and 1653, Heylyn’s thought on Tudor-era ecclesiastical history underwent a number of important changes. Whereas Elizabeth’s regime had been at the forefront of his argument against Burton, in 1653 Henry VIII and Edward VI were elevated to equal status. This

¹⁰⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 100.

¹⁰⁵¹ Ibid., p. 140.

time, Heylyn traced a single narrative through the reigns of all three Tudor monarchs: that reformation was the work of the clergy. This was, to a very significant extent, an argument against Catholic criticisms of the English church, and Heylyn identified his primary interlocutor as Nicholas Sander. Sander's work was of real and consistent concern to Heylyn, and after the restoration of both the Church of England and the monarchy in 1660, Heylyn continued to write against him. According to Heylyn's revised historiography of 1653, the Reformation of the English church took place in a series of three steps. The rejection of papal power and the restoration of royal supremacy together comprised the first step; translation of the Bible into the vernacular was the second step, and the reformation of doctrine was the third and final step. In his discussion of each of these points, Heylyn's claims can be generally verified, although from the vantage point of present scholarship his discussion sometimes lacks important nuances. Heylyn sometimes worked with older assumptions. His most consistently stated argument pertained to the royal supremacy, which 'led the way unto the *Reformation of Religion* which did after follow'.¹⁰⁵² This was no different than what Nicholas Udall had claimed, but Heylyn added considerable historical detail. He correctly noted that Henry approached Convocation in 1530 intent on enforcing statutes concerning *praemunire*, although he did not consider that the subsequent submission of the clergy was secured through anything other than wholly voluntary means. In Heylyn's words, 'in the Ejection of the Pope of Rome, which was the first and greatest step towards the work of *Reformation*, the *Parliament* did nothing, for ought it appears, but what was done before in the *Convocation*, and did no more than fortifie the Results of *Holy Church*,

¹⁰⁵² Peter Heylyn, *The Way of Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified* (London, 1653), p. 10; see also pp. 28; in the 1657 edition, the discussion was expanded on pp. 49 and 79.

by the addition and corroboration of the *Secular Power*.¹⁰⁵³ He informed his readers that what the church began, Parliament merely followed in.

In his account of the second step of reformation, Heylyn relocated the desire for a vernacular Bible to the archiepiscopal career of Archbishop Warham.¹⁰⁵⁴ This too was technically correct, although in fact Warham was highly resistant to such a translation, fearing that it would lead to the spread of heresy. The most that can be said of Warham is that in 1530, he argued against the creation and dissemination of a vernacular Bible, while nonetheless conceding that the king had the right to do otherwise.¹⁰⁵⁵ As with the royal supremacy, Heylyn depicted Bible translation as also being the work of the clergy. The same argument for clerical supremacy shaped his discussion of the third step, ‘the Reformation of Religion in points of Doctrine’.¹⁰⁵⁶ He argued that theological change was minimal, in large part because it was done in Convocation. Three works were singled out as representative of Convocation’s reformation under Henry VIII: the Six Articles (1536), *The Institution of a Christian Man* (1537; also known as the Bishop’s Book), and *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* (1543; also known as the King’s Book). In the first two of these, Heylyn explained, clergy took the lead; in the last, the king’s writings were ‘perused and perfected by the *Metropolitan*.’¹⁰⁵⁷ Parliament never directed reformation, but became involved in religious matters ‘onely in such Times when the hopes of Reformation were in the Wane, and the Work went retrograde.’¹⁰⁵⁸ Reformation was the work of church and king.

¹⁰⁵³ Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 14 – 15.

¹⁰⁵⁵ David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, four vols. (London, 1737), vol. 3, pp. 740 – 2.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Heylyn, *The Way of Reformation of the Church of England*, pp. 19 – 27.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 20.

Heylyn's historical apologetic drew upon two key earlier assumptions about the nature of reformation. On the one hand, his conception of reformation was like that of his Nonconformist opponents. Both defined reformation as a completed event; they differed in that Heylyn looked to the past for its completion, whereas Puritans looked to the future. This similarity is seen most clearly in Heylyn's use of steps as a descriptive metaphor. The royal supremacy 'was the first and greatest step towards the Work of *Reformation*', while translation of the Bible was the 'second step towards the Work of *Reformation*'.¹⁰⁵⁹ Each step was an act of reform that soon culminated in the identifiable completion of reformation. Neither Heylyn nor his opponents could conceive of reformation as partial. On the other hand, like John Foxe, whom he often cited,¹⁰⁶⁰ Heylyn perceived reformation as a cyclical and reoccurring event in the history of Christianity. Henry VIII's reformation was a pattern—the clergy taking the lead, the king aiding and concurring, and Parliament largely following—that simply repeated itself in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth.¹⁰⁶¹ Their respective reformations were thus one and the same as Henry's. Although he spent comparatively little time detailing the matter, Heylyn frequently emphasized that the English church had returned to the twofold pattern of ancient Israel and the early church. Reflecting his own antiquarian studies, he not only referred to the Old Testament and the patristic era,¹⁰⁶² but to Anglo-Saxon kings¹⁰⁶³ and to the scholarship of his late contemporaries Robert Cotton¹⁰⁶⁴ and Henry Spelman.¹⁰⁶⁵ Heylyn attended to the major trends of seventeenth-century scholarship while fusing them with the sixteenth-century typological appeal of John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Ibid., e.g., pp. 15, 17, 20, 28, 29, 36, 37.

¹⁰⁶¹ Ibid., e.g., pp. 24 – 6, 30 – 2.

¹⁰⁶² Ibid., e.g., p. 34.

¹⁰⁶³ Ibid., pp. 26 – 7.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 27. In the 1657 ed., this was supplemented with further references on pp. 57 and 87.

Despite his stated opposition to Sander, Heylyn's apologetic carried a set of political connotations directed not just at Catholic critics, but at the domestic ecclesial realities of the 1650s. In this, Heylyn's work of the early 1650s was no different than his work from the late 1630s. *The Way of Reformation* was a twofold attack upon all critics of the Church of England, whether Catholic or Nonconformist. This can be seen in two ways. One comes from the expanded, 1657 edition of the work. In 1653, *The Way of Reformation* was addressed 'To his much respected friend G.A. of W.', but four years later Heylyn framed the work as a very long letter written to an otherwise unidentified recipient named Hierophilus. The pseudonym is telling; 'Hierophilus' comes from the Greek nouns for priest and friendship, *hiereus* (ἱερεύς) and *philia* (φιλία), and translates as 'friend of priesthood'. Thousands of Anglican clergy had been forcibly removed from their parishes in the mid-1640s, and the Book of Common Prayer remained banned in the 1650s. Anyone identified as a friend of priesthood in mid-seventeenth century England was either part of the tiny Roman Catholic minority, or part of the far larger but sequestered Church of England. In arguing against Sander and other Roman Catholics, Heylyn had no need to justify the existence of priesthood, but in arguing against Nonconformists, few matters were more important. 'Hierophilus' could have been any lay or clerical supporter of the now-proscribed episcopal establishment.

There is a second reason to suspect additional if not ulterior motives for Heylyn's 1653 apologetic: his repeated slights of Parliament. Given Sander's argument, one can understand Heylyn's desire to minimize the influence of Parliament under the reforming Tudor monarchs—although in doing so, he tacitly conceded the validity of Sander's own point. However, in writing against Catholic critics, there was no reason for Heylyn to author the following statement about Parliament during the reign of Henry VIII: 'long it was not (I confess) before the *Parliament* put

in for a share, and claimed some interest in the Work [of Reformation]; but whether for the better, or the worse, I leave you to judge.’¹⁰⁶⁶ Several pages later, in discussing debates about the translation of the Bible, Heylyn went even further: ‘the Parliaments of those times did rather hinder and retard the work of *Reformation*, in some especial parts thereof, than give any furtherance to the same.’¹⁰⁶⁷ Here again, Heylyn presented reformation as a Foxean pattern. Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth all partook of the same pattern of clerically-led reform, aiding and supporting the Church of England in its attempt to restore the faith and practice of the early church. In Heylyn’s hands, Parliament always appeared antecedent to this work. But as under Henry, so too under Charles, Parliament interfered in spiritual matters wholly outside its ken. In the closing pages of his volume, Heylyn brought this argument full circle, writing, ‘’Tis true, indeed, that many Members of both Houses in these latter Times, had been very ready to embrace businesses which are offered to them, out of a probable hope of drawing the managery of all Affairs, aswel *Ecclesiastical* as *Civil*, into their own hands.’¹⁰⁶⁸ Unfolding his argument, Heylyn identified the Long Parliament, with its ‘*Committees for Religion*’, as the primary culprit.¹⁰⁶⁹ Parliamentary opposition to true reformation, initially witnessed under Henry VIII, had repeated itself under Charles I, first in the Long Parliament and then again in the Rump Parliament. Heylyn’s arguments against Parliament were an attempt to save *the* Reformation of the sixteenth-century from the rogue Parliamentary reformations of the seventeenth.

A second study of Tudor ecclesiastical history was published in 1654, another anonymously authored work entitled *A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation of the Church*

¹⁰⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 42.

of England by King Edward and Q. Elizabeth. Two editions of the work appeared that year.¹⁰⁷⁰

Internal evidence indicates that it was composed during the civil wars of the previous decade.

The unknown author began *A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation* by writing against war,¹⁰⁷¹ and frequently identified Charles I as ‘our Sovereign Lord the King that now is’, whose rule had lasted ‘until this present unhappy War began’.¹⁰⁷² Although the author mentioned martyrs in ‘these worst and last times’,¹⁰⁷³ there is no reason to assume that he or she sought to invoke the burgeoning cult of King Charles the Martyr. Given the text’s warm view of Charles’ reign and its description of the king as presently reigning, the lack of any such reference to Charles as a martyr indicates that if written before 1654, it was probably also written before the regicide as well. The basic argument of the text was simple: reformation necessarily produces peace in both church and state. Multiple historical references were used to vindicate this claim, and figures as diverse as Edward VI and Charles I were connected with earlier Christian kings such as Constantine and Edward the Confessor, and with ancient Israelite leaders such as king Josiah and the governor Zerubbabel.¹⁰⁷⁴ Constantine was central, and was identified as having called Nicaea ‘for settling the peace of the Church in matter of Religion’.¹⁰⁷⁵ The text claimed that Edward VI had also sought religious concord, and that after the reign of Mary, a continual succession of reforming and peace-loving monarchs followed, from Elizabeth to Charles.¹⁰⁷⁶ All of this was then upset by the recent wars.

¹⁰⁷⁰ The second edition was published by the otherwise unidentified A.M., who altered the title by replacing ‘brief’ with ‘short’. A.M.’s edition indicates no intended bookseller on its title page, but the two works are otherwise identical; even their respective Errata pages are the same.

¹⁰⁷¹ Anonymous, *A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation of the Church of England by King Edward and Q. Elizabeth* (London, 1654), sig. A3v.

¹⁰⁷² Ibid., p. 52; for other references to Charles I as presently reigning, see pp. 45 and 60.

¹⁰⁷³ Ibid., sig. A3.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 19 and 28 (Edward the Confessor), 7 (Josiah), and 53 (Zerubbabel).

¹⁰⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Ibid., e.g., p. 60; other discussion on the centrality of peace can be found on, e.g., sig. A4v, pp. 1, 29, 49 – 52.

A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation bears the imprint of earlier works and historiographical traditions surrounding the sixteenth century. It drew upon the *Chronicle* of Johann Sleidan for its understanding of sixteenth century European history.¹⁰⁷⁷ The author evidently had access to at least some key older sources; Sleidan's *Chronicle* had not been published in England since 1560. Like the *Actes and Monuments* of John Foxe, reformation was portrayed as a recurring event in the life of the church, and the Marian martyrs were described as those who 'lighted such a Candle in England of Reformed Religion as should never be put out.'¹⁰⁷⁸ The influence of John Hayward's historiography was also evident. The author wrote of 'the Protestants beyond the Seas'—a phrase straight out of Hayward's history of Edward VI—and, like Hayward, portrayed Elizabeth as having wholly transcended the confessional divisions of her day.¹⁰⁷⁹ Like Elizabethan apologetics, the author defined proponents of Genevan church government as opponents of these great monarchical reformations,¹⁰⁸⁰ and identified coercion as the unique preserve of the papacy, Henry VIII, and the fourth-century Arians.¹⁰⁸¹ Although probably written in the 1640s and thus oriented toward the concerns of that tumultuous decade, *A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation* synthesized some of the major historiographical trends of preceding generations.

Unlike some modern historians who differentiate a multiplicity of English Reformations, seventeenth-century authors saw no such distinctions. If the tendency today is to emphasize differences at the expense of continuities, the exact opposite was the historiographical norm in the seventeenth century. Like John Hayward, *A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation* indicated no knowledge of the variations between the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 36.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 10, 60.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 35 – 37.

¹⁰⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 29 (Boniface, VIII), 53 (Henry VIII), 54 (Arians).

Rather, their complex history appeared much more simply: ‘ancient Liturgies’ were revived in 1549, made ‘compleat and perfect’ in 1552, and finally ‘restored’ by Elizabeth.¹⁰⁸² By the standards of modern scholarship, such a description is quite debatable, and the author’s tendency towards homogenization could also produce factual errors. The reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth were sometimes conflated in the pamphlet by assuming that developments distinct to each reign were actually shared across them. One such mistake concerned the revised Edwardian canon law. The author, apparently unaware that the canon law had twice failed to gain the approval of Parliament, portrayed it as having been first enacted by the young king and then restored under Elizabeth.¹⁰⁸³ Perhaps the author did not even know the canon law. On the one hand, the pamphlet claimed that the church government outlined in it ‘differs not in the method of Government from the Presbyteriall way founded by *Calvin*, but barely in terms’.¹⁰⁸⁴ This overlooked the fact that the canon law retained episcopal government. On the other hand, the author also claimed that if Calvin’s Presbyterian discipline were imposed on England, three things would happen: ‘1. The King must of necessity lose of his authority. 2. The people of their Liberty. 3. The Common Law of its jurisdiction.’¹⁰⁸⁵ Looking north of England, the pamphlet claimed that Presbyterianism was founded in Geneva and that Scotland adopted it soon after, but that through Elizabeth as a divine instrument, God had rejected it in England.¹⁰⁸⁶

Homogenization, confusion, and apologetic were bound to one another in these pages.

Thomas Fuller took a very different approach in his 1655 volume *The Church-History of Britain*. Like Heylyn, Fuller wrote his work with an eye to present political realities, but his immense tome began not with the Tudors but with the debate over the origins of Christianity in

¹⁰⁸² Ibid., pp. 21, 22, 25.

¹⁰⁸³ Ibid., pp. 33 – 4 (under Edward), 39 – 40 (under Elizabeth).

¹⁰⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 40.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 43 – 5.

Britain: ‘who it was that first brought over the Gospell into Britain, is very uncertain’.¹⁰⁸⁷ Fuller concluded with the regicide of Charles I, a telling terminus for his sweeping and all-encompassing *longue durée*. In the opening address to the reader, Fuller wrote, ‘*blessed be God, the Church of England is still (and long may it be) in being, though disturb’d, distempered, distracted, God help and heal her most sad condition.*’¹⁰⁸⁸ Fuller was a royalist episcopalian who used historical scholarship to justify his entrenched defiance of the reigning regime.

In section ‘R’ of the Index that concludes the *Church-History*, Fuller referred those interested in ‘*Our REFORMATION*’ to look at a short two-page discussion of the matter in Book V, which covered the reign of Henry VIII.¹⁰⁸⁹ There Fuller explained the matter quite simply. ‘Three things are Essential to justifie the *English Reformation*, from the *scandal of Schisme*, to shew, that they had 1. Just *cause* for which 2. True *authority* by which 3. Due *moderation* in what’—and with a bracket that connected all three points together, he concluded each with the phrase ‘they deceded from *Rome*.’¹⁰⁹⁰ The cause was justified by ‘*Scripture* and *Primitive practice*’; the authority was that of a national church, because ‘the most *regular way*, was by order from a *Free and Generall Councell*, but here alas no hope thereof’; and finally, the moderation ‘disclaimed onely the *ulcers* and *sores*, not what was *sound* of the *Romish Church*, retaining still what was *consonant* to *Antiquity*, in the *Four first Generall Councils*.’¹⁰⁹¹ As with so much other apologetic literature, Fuller’s response to Catholic critics emphasized continuity with a prior golden age—continuity that Rome also shared, despite its alleged errors. Unlike Heylyn, who understood the Reformation as a Tudor typological pattern, Fuller located the Reformation quite firmly in the reign of Edward VI. With the death of Henry VIII, Edward VI

¹⁰⁸⁷ Thomas Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain*, Book I, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, no pag.

¹⁰⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, no pag.

¹⁰⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, Book V, p. 194.

¹⁰⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 194, 195.

ascended the throne, and under the guidance of his uncle Edward Seymour, the Duke of Somerset, ‘took speedy order for Reformation of Religion.’¹⁰⁹² Unlike contemporary scholarship, which focuses so much upon Edwardian iconoclasm, Fuller claimed that under Somerset, the English churches actually underwent a period of extensive repair and restoration.¹⁰⁹³ The reparation of churches, together with the content of Edward’s injunctions, underscored the moderation of England’s first reformers.¹⁰⁹⁴ Somerset thus appeared in a positive light, but Fuller’s emphasis on moderation soon began to resound with echoes of mid-seventeenth century political and theological debate. He traced this discord back to Edward’s reign.

As the epigraph of the present chapter indicates, Fuller looked upon the development of Nonconformity as ‘the saddest difference that ever happened in the *Church of England*’. He summarized these developments in a two-column chart that compared conformity with its converse:

Founders of Conformity

1. Such as remained here all the Reign of King *Henry the eighth*, and *weathered* out the tempest of His tyrannie at open Sea, partly by a politick compliance, and partly by a cautious concealment of themselves.
2. These, in the daies of King *Edward the sixth*, were possessed of the best preferments in the

Founders of Non-Conformity

1. Such as fled hence beyond the Seas, chiefly into *Germany*, where, living in States, and Cities of popular Reformation, they suck'd in both the aire, and discipline of the place they lived in.
2. These, returning late into *England*, were at a losse for meanes, and maintenance, onely

¹⁰⁹² Ibid., Book VII, p. 372.

¹⁰⁹³ Ibid., Book VII, p. 375.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Ibid., Book VII, pp. 374 – 5.

land.

3. And retained many ceremonies practiced in the *Romish Church*, conceiving them to be antient, and decent in themselves.

4. The authority of *Cranmer*, and activity of *Ridley* headed this party; the former being the highest, the latter the hottest in defence of conformity.

supported with the reputation of being *Confessors*, rendring their *patience* to the *praise*, and their *persons* to the *pity* of all conscientious people.

3. And renounced all ceremonies practiced by the Papists, conceiving, that such ought not onely to be clipt with the sheers, but to be shaved with a raizor; yea, all the stumps thereof to be pluckt out.

4. *John Rogers*, Lecturer in *S. Pauls*, and Vicar of *S. Sepulchres*, with *John Hooper*, afterwards Bishop of *Glocester*, were Ring-leaders of this party.¹⁰⁹⁵

Two of the points in the right-hand column echoed recent events. In the first point, Nonconformists demanded ‘popular Reformation’, which Charles I had opposed in *Eikon Basilike* but which emerged victorious with his execution. In the third point, which concerned the Book of Common Prayer and its ceremonies, Fuller portrayed Edwardian Nonconformists as identical to opponents of the Caroline regime. Both wanted to clip, shave, and uproot all purportedly popish practices, and thus undertake a reformation of the Church of England in root and branch. Charles I had defended the English liturgy as well, but from the civil wars onward, the Prayer Book had been proscribed. In the 1640s, Edwardian-era agitation came full circle.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Ibid., Book VII, p. 402.

In the fourth point of his chart, Fuller identified John Rogers and John Hooper as the twin fonts of Nonconformity, but in the narrative itself, Hooper emerged as the more important of the two. Fuller's portrayal of Hooper was loaded; not only did his narrative reference debates about clerical vestments, which were still a hot topic in the 1650s, but it also drew upon mid-seventeenth century upset over the profanation of churches. Throughout this narrative, Hooper was both a cipher and a nexus for Fuller's own concerns. Nominated for the see of Gloucester, Hooper had refused to wear episcopal vestments. Opposed by Nicholas Ridley, one of Fuller's great conformist heroes, Hooper was imprisoned until he relented in his opposition. Fuller correctly pointed out that Hooper was connected with the Duke of Northumberland, but following the historiographical tracks of prior decades, Fuller not only portrayed Northumberland as a self-serving and greedy conspirator, but Hooper as well.¹⁰⁹⁶ Fuller alleged that Hooper 'scrupled the poor Bishoprick of *Gloucester*' less because he opposed vestments than because he coveted the far wealthier see of Worcester. This brought Hooper into still more conflict with yet another orthodox conformist—in this case, Hugh Latimer, who had briefly held the see of Worcester under Henry VIII. As Fuller elaborated this Edwardian ecclesiastical intrigue, he included a marginal reference to Joshua 7:21, which contains the key to Fuller's polemic. Joshua 7 tells the story of Achan, who coveted and then stole some of the silver and gold dedicated to God in the tabernacle. Fuller used this to create an allusive typological comparison in which Latimer appeared as God's treasury and Hooper as Achan.¹⁰⁹⁷ Here as elsewhere, Fuller drew the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries together. He concluded his narrative of the rise of Nonconformity by writing that subsequent generations of Nonconformists became progressively worse under Elizabeth and James, until under Charles they became guilty

¹⁰⁹⁶ Ibid., Book VII, p. 404.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Ibid.; Latimer is described as a treasury on Book VII, p. 405.

of the destruction and spoliation of the English church.¹⁰⁹⁸ Like Hooper, who sought to steal from God's treasury, Hooper's theological descendants had pillaged churches in the 1640s and 1650s, stealing their wealth and undermining the stability of the kingdom in the process.

Fuller next described the unhappy state of the Edwardian council. As with other similar accounts, John Dudley emerged as the principal villain. Fuller locked Somerset and Northumberland in a duel of opposing character traits; Seymour's virtues were transformed and inverted in Dudley, in whom they reappeared as vices. Somerset was '*free spirited, open hearted, humble, hard to distrust, easie to forgive*', while Northumberland was '*proud, suttile, close, cruell, and revengefull*'.¹⁰⁹⁹ Slightly later, when Fuller wrote that 'The Duke of Somerset was *religious* himself, a *lover* of all such as were so, and a great *Promoter of Reformation*,'¹¹⁰⁰ the reader had already been primed to assume that Dudley was the converse. Fuller then led his readers to see precisely this. Somerset piously sought to remove idolatry from the kingdom while simultaneously restoring numerous churches, but Northumberland ransacked England's parishes for their wealth and even deprived them of what they needed for administration of the sacraments. Citing John Hayward, Fuller explained that the king's commissioners, operating under the oversight of the Privy Council, 'left but *one silver Chalice* to every Church, too narrow a proportion to populous Parishes, where they might have left two at the least'. This was nothing more than greed, and 'All this *Income* rather stayed the stomach, than satisfied the hunger of the Kings Exchequer.' When the government turned its sights on the bishopric of Durham and sought to divert its income to the crown, the real culprit was again Northumberland, who 'either was, or was to be possessour thereof.'¹¹⁰¹ In the last half of Edward's reign, the boy king's

¹⁰⁹⁸ Ibid., Book VII, p. 406.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Ibid., Book VII, p. 408.

¹¹⁰⁰ Ibid., Book VII, p. 410.

¹¹⁰¹ Ibid., Book VII, p. 419.

regime had abandoned its commitment to reformation and simply sought its own self-aggrandizement. This led both to its ruin in the sixteenth century, and the ruin of England in Fuller's own time.

The *Church-History*'s account of Edwardian England was haunted by more recent events. The history of Somerset's downfall read like a narrative of the regicide of Charles I. According to Fuller, Northumberland recognized at the outset of his conspiratorial intrigues that he 'could not erect his intended Fabrick of Sovereignty except he first cleared the groundwork from all obstructive rubbish, where this Duke of *Somerset* was the Principall'.¹¹⁰² In the final pages of Book VII, as Dudley began to plot against Somerset, the latter increasingly appeared as a Christ-figure, preparing for crucifixion. Alluding to the Gospel according to John, in which Roman soldiers divided Jesus' clothes amongst themselves,¹¹⁰³ Fuller wrote that Somerset, seeing the traps before him, desired to retire to the country, 'there to attend his own Devotions.' In asking Edward VI for permission to do so, he 'saved himself from being *stript by others* by first *putting off his own clothes*.'¹¹⁰⁴ Finally, like Christ—and perhaps more importantly, like Charles I, who was widely perceived as being like Christ—both onlookers and the wider English populace greeted Somerset's death with astonishment and outrage. Through such comparisons, Fuller assimilated the early Edwardian regime to Caroline orthodoxy, and mid-sixteenth century conformity to mid-seventeenth century royalist suffering.

III.

Anti-Catholic apologetics aided historical publications in disseminating the view that sixteenth-century history had seen a distinct event termed '*the Reformation*'. The first of these

¹¹⁰² Ibid., Book VII, p. 408.

¹¹⁰³ John 19:23.

¹¹⁰⁴ Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain*, Book VII, p. 408.

was Henry Ferne's 1652 treatise *Of the Division between the English and the Romish Church upon the Reformation*. It proved popular enough to be revised and reprinted twice in 1655, both as a stand-alone volume and as an addendum to *A Compendious Discourse*, another of Ferne's anti-Catholic works. The *Division* opened with Ferne responding to the decades-old Catholic question, 'Where was your Church before *Luther*?'¹¹⁰⁵ His initial reply, that a reformed church was not a new church, was foundational for all that followed. According to Ferne, Rome was guilty of the schism between the two churches because 'they, when we and all nations cal'd for Reformation, remained incorrigible; We did our duty, they would not doe theirs'.¹¹⁰⁶ Ferne was not concerned to specify the content of these calls; he was instead concerned with the doctrine of the church. In the process of defending 'the Reformation'—in the 1655 revision, he termed it 'the English Reformation'¹¹⁰⁷—Ferne elaborated a fairly complex theology of the church and the interrelationship of local and ecumenical councils. He argued that the Church of Rome was not coterminous with the Catholic Church, and that the Church of England, having purged itself of Roman errors in the sixteenth century, had restored the Catholic orthodoxy of prior ages.

Ferne offered a theological justification for Christian ecclesiastical division. Early in the work, he argued that when an ecumenical council could not be had, provincial and national synods had both the right and the responsibility to reform their respective portions of the Church.¹¹⁰⁸ Ferne proposed that just as provincial synods oversaw most ecclesiastical matters even after Constantine, the same was true of the reforms instituted in sixteenth-century England.¹¹⁰⁹ Drawing upon writings by the Church Fathers, and especially Augustine, Ferne

¹¹⁰⁵ Henry Ferne, *Of the Division Between the English and Romish Church upon the Reformation* (London, 1652), p. 6.

¹¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 29 – 30.

¹¹⁰⁷ Henry Ferne, *Of the Division Between the English and Romish Church upon the Reformation* (London, 1655), p. 38.

¹¹⁰⁸ Ferne, *Division* (1652), pp. 21ff.

¹¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25 – 6.

argued that just as there was once an African church, an Asian church, and a Greek church, there was also, by extension, an English church.¹¹¹⁰ The records of the early Church indicated that regional variation was nothing new in the history of Christianity. Problems only existed when papal attempts at centralization undermined an otherwise unified faith and practice. The earliest Christian centuries had seen acute controversy over matters as foundational as baptism, which had caused one particular regional church to excommunicate the rest: ‘upon the heat of the Romish Bishops...it came to an actual denying of Communion with the *Asian* and *African* Churches.’¹¹¹¹ Citing the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, Ferne drew a historical parallel between the third-century church and his own era. In ancient debates over baptism, most churches rejected the decisions of the popes. The same was true—albeit, concerning other matters—in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The exercise of local authority defined ‘the English Reformation’, which proceeded ‘upon publick Judgement of a Nationall Church in Provinciaall Synods’.¹¹¹² Based upon the example of the early church, the Church of England had every right to rebuff papal error.

Although initially spurred by the Catholic critique of the Church of England, Ferne also used his work to write against Nonconformists. Two of his arguments were especially pointed in this regard. First, he drew upon the decades-old Anglican polemic against Arians by comparing the Anglican underground of his own day with the turmoil of the church in prior ages, particularly the mid-fourth century. In his opening address ‘To the Reader’, Ferne traced a brief history of exile from ancient Israel through the early church. ‘*If the Lord has now covered this Church with a cloud in his anger, it is but what he did to Zion.*’ Shortly thereafter, he further elaborated, ‘When the Church under the violence of Arrian Emperours was persecuted, scattered,

¹¹¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 91 – 6 .

¹¹¹¹ Ibid., pp. 97 – 8.

¹¹¹² Ibid., p. 38.

Bishops driven from their Seas, and all good Christian people (that would not communicate with Heresie and Schisme) driven from the publick places of Worship, and put to meet as they could, and where they could; yet so they continued the Communion of the Church.’¹¹¹³ By setting up such a stark contrast between Anglicans and their domestic opponents, Ferne very bluntly claimed that the religious realities of his own day were defined by the most theologically extensive of all ancient Christian heresies. This laid a foundation for his second argument, which addressed the Catholic accusation that if Anglicans could separate themselves from Rome, then Nonconformists could also separate themselves from the Church of England.¹¹¹⁴ Ferne argued that Dissenters had failed to return to the norms of the early church, which he described as both apostolic and Patristic.¹¹¹⁵ It was thus unfair for Catholics to draw any lines of connection or comparison between the English Reformation and the religious divisions of the mid-seventeenth century. Ferne entitled section XIII of the *Division* ‘Our way opens not a gap to Sectaries’,¹¹¹⁶ and in it he explained, ‘hereby was this Church held together in Unity, no Sect or Heresie breaking out, which was not presently crushed, till force of Armes bore down the free use of Ecclesiastick Authority, and emboldened men to contemne it.’¹¹¹⁷ On this telling, English sectarians had no valid reason for separating themselves from the Church of England. Their separation was a matter of violence, illegality, and above all, heresy; their actions resulted not in orthodoxy but its antithesis. The English Reformation of the sixteenth century was a restoration of pristine patristic purity, which Dissenters had recently overthrown.

Edward Boughen wrote a similar exposition of the sixteenth century. Entitled *An Account of the Church Catholick*, it consisted of an epistolary exchange of four letters between T.B., a

¹¹¹³ Ibid., no pag.

¹¹¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 39 – 43.

¹¹¹⁵ Ibid., see esp. pp. 203 – 09.

¹¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 80 – 3.

¹¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 81.

Catholic, and Boughen. T.B. wrote the first and third letters; the second and fourth letters were Boughen's responses. Throughout their correspondence, Boughen sought to answer T.B.'s Catholic challenge, 'Where was your church before Luther?' The question punctuates the volume.¹¹¹⁸ However, Boughen had little interest in Luther himself, who appeared in the narrative as but one among many other, earlier individuals who had also exposed the errors of the Roman church. For Boughen, following a long line of English precedent, there was no necessary link between Luther and the English Reformation. At the heart of his enterprise was a simple argument: the relationship between the Church of Rome and the wider Catholic Church was like that between a single limb and the whole human body. This was a new use of an old descriptive metaphor, but Boughen's argument was effectively no different than Ferne's. For both apologists, the English church could exist distinct from Rome without also existing in division from the Catholic Church. England's reformation—'our Reformation',¹¹¹⁹ in Boughen's words—returned the English church to the example of earliest Christianity. Before Luther, the Catholic Church had always been; after the Reformation, the Church of England had simply returned to the Catholic Church by repenting of Roman error.

The debate between Boughen and T.B. was a debate about the orthodox past. In his first letter, T.B. requested, 'I desire to be shewn the Catholick Church distinct from the Church of *Rome*, and those in her communion for the last 1100 years'.¹¹²⁰ This opening set the parameters for the entire correspondence. Regrettably, T.B. did not offer a reason for his qualification of 'the last 1100 years'. Boughen found this stricture confusing, and in his reply to the first letter, asked, 'why *for the last 1100 years*? Is it because ye dare not trust to the former ages?'¹¹²¹ Boughen

¹¹¹⁸ Edward Boughen, *An Account of the Church Catholick* (London, 1653), e.g., pp. 6, 16, 29, 30, 36, 43.

¹¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

certainly did, and primarily relied on Biblical and Patristic sources. Cyprian and Augustine were evident favorites,¹¹²² but Tertullian,¹¹²³ Vincent of Lerins,¹¹²⁴ and John Chrysostom¹¹²⁵ also appeared with regular frequency. Turning to later sources, Boughen cited Aquinas twice,¹¹²⁶ but there were very few references to modern theologians.¹¹²⁷ Among recent English authors, Laud alone was cited with regular frequency.¹¹²⁸ Boughen's focus on antiquity was intended to vindicate what he believed was the principal difference between the Roman and English churches. Like William Perkins, Boughen argued that Rome's fundamental fault pertained to the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Roman church was guilty of 'maiming' the Eucharist by transforming it into a 'halfe communion' and thereby depriving the sacrament of its efficacy.¹¹²⁹ The English church broke communion with Rome in the present in order to restore communion with the doctrine and practice of the early church. T.B. had requested that Boughen not draw upon the patristic era in his response, but far from being a point of minor divergence, this pointed to the very heart of their dispute. Different canons of historical appeal grounded different criteria of theological justification.

In his second letter, T.B. inquired about the historical origins of the schism between England and Rome. In response, Boughen marshaled a series of arguments that collectively placed the burden of Christian division upon the papacy. Because Boughen recognized no difference between the revised liturgies of 1549 and those that came after, he erroneously presumed that until Elizabeth was excommunicated, all English Christians had communed

¹¹²² Ibid., for Cyprian, e.g., pp. 7, 8, 12, 14 – 16, 19, 21, 23, 28, 40, 45, 52, 60; for Augustine, e.g., pp. 7, 13, 14, 37, 39, 50, 52, 56, 57, 59, 62.

¹¹²³ Ibid., e.g., pp. 7, 13, 19, 40, 50, 52.

¹¹²⁴ Ibid., e.g., pp. 22 – 4, 40 – 1, 43, 62 – 3.

¹¹²⁵ Ibid., e.g., pp. 5, 25 – 6, 49, 55, 58.

¹¹²⁶ Ibid., pp. 12, 15.

¹¹²⁷ Nonetheless see the references to Jean Gerson (p. 18), Nicholas of Lyra (pp. 22, 27), and Pierre d'Ailly (p. 27).

¹¹²⁸ Ibid., e.g., pp. 12, 16, 21, 22, 29, 32, 43, 53, 55.

¹¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 42, 56; see also pp. 12, 57.

together in the same church. Bishops Edmund Bonner and Stephen Gardiner, who later became stalwart supporters of the Marian regime, had accepted the first Book of Common Prayer; Boughen seems to have assumed that they accepted by default the liturgies that came after, and that the rest of the Catholic populace did as well. ‘*Bonner and Gardiner* communicated with us in them; and so did most of the *Romane Catholicks* of this Nation, for ten yeers under Queen *Elizabeth*, till that terrible Bull of *Pius Quintus* came thundering out.’¹¹³⁰ In truth, this was a terrible muddle of historical fact. Gardiner died in 1555, and under Elizabeth, Bonner was deprived of his bishopric for refusing the royal supremacy, was subsequently imprisoned, and finally died in 1569. Nonetheless, Boughen continued, it was only in the wake of Elizabeth’s excommunication that Catholics became increasingly treasonous, until they finally launched the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. The combined weight of excommunication and attempted assassination deepened and ultimately confirmed a papally-mandated schism. Boughen did not harmonize the theological justification of his first response with the historical description of his second response, but in both cases Rome was to blame. The English Reformation was at once the story of Rome’s guilt and England’s innocence.

IV.

Much of the literature surveyed above also touched upon the diverse definitions of Protestantism that existed among the religious parties of mid-seventeenth century England. John Milton concluded *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* with a selection of statements from ‘true Ministers of the Protestant doctrine, taught by those abroad, famous and religious men, who first reformd the Church, or by those no less zealous, who withstood corruption and the Bishops heer

¹¹³⁰ Ibid., pp. 57.

at home, branded with the name of Puritans and Nonconformists'.¹¹³¹ Some of Milton's authorities were continental figures, such as Martin Luther; others, such as Martin Bucer, had come to England from Europe.¹¹³² But despite appearances—Milton's authorities appear, especially today, as major figures—these excerpts collectively comprised a weak political claim. Milton began his survey of Protestant divines with three quotations by Luther, all of which were found in Johannes Sleidan's *Chronicles*. The first two selections came from Sleidan's fifth book, which covered the Peasants' Revolt of 1525 and thus contained Luther's repudiation of Thomas Muntzer and the peasants who followed him. By setting Luther within a set of quotations that purportedly vindicated the regicide, Milton completely inverted the German evangelical. In both Sleidan's *Chronicles* and elsewhere, Luther argued that Christian subjects should always obey their political rulers. Whether intentionally or not, Milton's portrayal of Luther could not have been more misleading. The same was true of Milton's use of John Calvin,¹¹³³ Martin Bucer, and David Paraeus; none of the citations vindicated regicide. Only the selections from Zwingli, with their appeals to the sufferings of the people under the tyranny of kings, offered any kind of support for Milton's politics. Perhaps this is why Zwingli was cited six times, whereas Luther was cited three times, Calvin twice, and Bucer and Paraeus but once.

When Milton turned in this same section to sixteenth-century British figures, he began most tellingly in Scotland with John Knox, and only then quoted the English Puritans Anthony Gilby, an associate of Thomas Cartwright, and Christopher Goodman, an associate of Knox. Milton also briefly mentioned Dudley Fenner, who led the charge against subscription in Elizabethan Kent, and William Whittingham. Drawing all of these figures together, Milton

¹¹³¹ Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, p. 47.

¹¹³² Ibid., pp. 47 – 8 (Luther); 50 (Bucer). Milton also cites Zwingli (p. 49), Calvin (pp. 49 – 50), and Paraeus (50 – 1).

¹¹³³ It is curious that Milton appealed only to Calvin's commentary on the prophet Daniel, when the *Institutio* concluded with a pointed restatement of magisterial resistance theory against the king of France.

summarized, 'These were the true Protestant Divines of *England*, our fathers in the faith we hold'.¹¹³⁴ By linking Puritans, all of whom had gotten into trouble with the Elizabethan government, with Scottish figures such as Knox and continental religious leaders such as Luther and Calvin, Milton gave 'Protestant' a highly partisan meaning. On the penultimate page of the *Tenure*, Milton even declared that regicide was a cardinal Protestant doctrine:

If any one shall goe about by bringing other testimonies to disable these, or by bringing these against themselves in other cited passages of thir Books, he will not only faile to make good that fals and impudent assertion of those mutinous Ministers, that the deposing and punishing of a King or Tyrant, *is against the constant Judgement of all Protestant Divines*, it being quite the contrary, but will prove rather, what perhaps he intended not, that the judgement of Divines, if it be so various and inconstant to it self, is not considerable, or to be esteem'd at all.¹¹³⁵

With these words, Milton returned to his initial target: Presbyterians who opposed the regicide. Milton not only laid at their feet the charge that they were 'mutinous', but also the more weighty accusation that if they maintained their current position, they would be guilty of fundamentally subverting Protestantism itself. By appealing to opponents of the Church of England, Milton denied supporters of the abolished Church of England the right to call themselves Protestant; by making regicide the *sine qua non* of Protestantism, he denied the same to his Presbyterian opponents.

A diametrically opposite use of 'Protestant' can be found in Fuller's *Church-History*. Milton defined Protestantism with reference to support for regicide, but Fuller defined Protestantism with reference to civil obedience. This argument appeared, however, long before

¹¹³⁴ Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, p. 53.

¹¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 59 – 60.

Fuller's discussion of Charles I or even the sixteenth century. Rather, by arguing against Catholic heresiological arguments that connected John Wyclif to Protestantism, Fuller hit out against interpretations of Protestantism that connected it with rebellion. As noted in the previous chapter, John Foxe had identified Wyclif as the beginning of the most recent era of reformation in the church; Wyclif appeared in the *Actes and Monuments* as one of many prophets raised up by God for the reformation of the church, such as Catherine of Siena and Martin Luther. In response to Foxe, Catholic polemicists subsequently connected Wyclif with a long genealogy of heresy that culminated in Protestantism. Fuller, however, complicated the relationship between Wyclif and Protestantism by noting that Protestants did not maintain all of Wyclif's ideas.¹¹³⁶ Fuller lamented that Wyclif's books had been lost, which made it impossible to fully understand his doctrine,¹¹³⁷ but he had a solid understanding of Wyclif's theology and treated it ambivalently: 'Yea, some of his poysonous passages, dres'd with due caution, would prove not onely wholesome, but cordial truths'.¹¹³⁸ At the very least, connections between Wyclif and the Protestants were not as easy as Catholics assumed; at most, Catholics had overstated and thus misstated the case.

As Fuller discussed Wyclif's career and the broader history of the fourteenth-century English church, he joined his own partisan definition of Protestantism—that it is inherently obedient and peaceable—to a clearly stated concern to rebuff Catholic attacks upon the English church. Turning to the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, Fuller described Wat Tyler and John Ball (named in the text as Jack Straw) as '*pure Levellers*' who 'seemed also to be much for *Reformation*'.¹¹³⁹ In this, they deceived their followers and 'cast it [reformation] off in the heat

¹¹³⁶ Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain*, Book IV, p. 134.

¹¹³⁷ Ibid., Book IV, pp. 134 – 5.

¹¹³⁸ Ibid., Book IV, p. 135.

¹¹³⁹ Ibid., Book IV, pp. 138 – 9.

of their success, as not onely useless, but burdensome unto them'.¹¹⁴⁰ Fuller's use of the term 'Levellers' allowed him to connect Tyler and Ball with those who, in the mid-seventeenth century, were accused of anarchical intents and labeled with the same term. Notably, when Fuller reached Book XI, which recounted the civil wars, he accused Independents, already defined in Book VII as descendants of Edwardian Nonconformists, of also intending anarchy.¹¹⁴¹ This terminological blurring of distinct historical eras allowed Fuller to accuse Catholic heresiologists of an important contradiction: having blamed Wyclif for inspiring the Peasants' Revolt, and having also linked Wyclif with the longer history of Protestantism, Catholics failed to account for the fact that 'The modern Protestants...abominate these Rebels their levelling'.¹¹⁴² Levellers and Nonconformists were one and the same in the *Church-History*. Fuller's definition of 'Protestant' was wholly antagonistic to Milton's.

Fuller's Protestants were those who shared his own theological and political convictions. In Book IV, he noted that churches were violated in the popular tumults led by the fourteenth-century 'Levellers', and that the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury, was beheaded and became a 'State-Martyr'.¹¹⁴³ Given the rarity of archiepiscopal beheadings, it is difficult to imagine that anyone could have read about Sudbury without also recalling the far more recent beheading of Archbishop Laud. It is also difficult to imagine that Fuller's use of the phrase 'State-Martyr' was accidental. As far back as 1644, Peter Heylyn had described Laud as a martyr, and in his posthumously published biography of the archbishop, described Laud as 'a Martyr of the English Church and State'.¹¹⁴⁴ In Fuller's *Church-History*, the civil wars of the 1640s had a

¹¹⁴⁰ Ibid., Book IV, p. 139.

¹¹⁴¹ Ibid., Book XI, p. 205.

¹¹⁴² Ibid., Book IV, p. 142.

¹¹⁴³ Ibid., Book IV, p. 140.

¹¹⁴⁴ Peter Heylyn, *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Syfferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate The L. Archbishop of Canterbvry* (London, 1644), pp. 14 and 15; the phrase 'a Martyr of the English Church and State' is found in the dedication of Heylyn's posthumously published *Cyprianvs Anglicvs* (London, 1668), sig. A2.

direct historical precedent in Peasants' Revolt of 1381. In both eras, Levellers were enemies of the English church. Protestantism, as the opponent of both fourteenth- and seventeenth-century 'levelling', signified not rebellion but obedience.

Milton's conception of Protestant gained the legal upper hand when the *Humble Petition and Advice*, a new constitution, was promulgated on 25 May 1657. There was a considerable amount of conceptual continuity across the two Cromwellian constitutions, but the religious strictures of the *Humble Petition and Advice* made political requirements explicit in a way that the *Instrument of Government* sometimes did not. Catholics,¹¹⁴⁵ like those considered guilty of licentiousness,¹¹⁴⁶ were banned from political participation by both documents. Although royalists were originally prevented from participating in Parliament for a space of twelve years, this temporary ban was made permanent in 1657. The one exception to the new rule was likely a response to continued royalist uprisings: 'unless he or they have since born Arms for the Parliament or Your Highness [re: Cromwell], or otherwise given signal Testimony of his or their good Affection to the Commonwealth, and continued faithful to the same.'¹¹⁴⁷ Those who had officially changed sides were given the right of political participation. Collectively, these requirements had one simple goal: to establish 'the true Protestant Christian Religion'—a phrase that appeared throughout the *Humble Petition and Advice*, above all in the oaths taken by government officials.¹¹⁴⁸ Chief Magistrates, Privy Councilors, and the members of Parliament all vowed 'in the presence, and by the Name of God Almighty, promise and swear, That to the uttermost of my power I will uphold, and maintain the true Reformed Protestant Christian Religion'. In 1657, as the Protectorate sought to solidify its grasp upon the British nations, the

¹¹⁴⁵ *The Government of the Common-Wealth* (London, 1654), n. XV, p. 12; *The Parliament of England and Wales, Humble Petition and Advice* (London, 1657), n. IV, p. 4.

¹¹⁴⁶ *The Government of the Common-Wealth*, n. XXXVII, p. 18; *Humble Petition and Advice*, n. XI, p. 13.

¹¹⁴⁷ *Humble Petition and Advice*, n. IV, pp. 4–5; cf. *The Government of the Common-Wealth*, n. XIV, p. 12.

¹¹⁴⁸ *Humble Petition and Advice* (1657), n. XI, p. 12; see the oaths, pp. 26–7, 27, 28–9.

government defined Protestantism as something fundamentally distinct from ‘Popery’, ‘Prelacy’, and ‘Licentiousness’. Although Presbyterians balked at the convictions of their Independent neighbors throughout the 1640s and 1650s, and although Independents such as Milton alleged that opposition to the regicide deprived Presbyterians of the right to call themselves Protestant, the Cromwellian allowance of both groups meant that each was considered equally ‘Protestant’ by the regime. The Church of England was neither reformed nor Protestant.

Chapter Six

Reformed Catholics, True Protestants:

The Sixteenth Century in Later Stuart England

'A Reformed Catholique (properly so called) is an Apostolical Christian, or a Son of the Church of England: A true Protestant may be so too; nay, and many times he is so; and many a Loyal, Orthodox, Reformed Catholique calls himself so; and (according to the stile of the Age) he may be well enough said and accounted so to be.'

- Roger L'Estrange, *The Reformed Catholique: Or, The True Protestant*, pp. 1 – 2¹¹⁴⁹

I.

The return of Charles II to England on 29 May 1660 temporarily submerged the historiographical developments of the mid-1650s beneath a surging tide of much older theological issues. If the output of the printing presses is indicative, debates about the reformation of episcopacy and liturgy were far more important to most people than debates about sixteenth-century ecclesiastical history. Even before his return, Charles II's own words and actions had drawn unsettled religious matters to the forefront of public consciousness. His Declaration of Breda, issued on 14 April 1660 and published in England on 1 May, contained the following discussion of religion:

And because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in Religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other, which when they shall hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation will be composed or better understood: We do declare a Liberty to Tender Consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of Religion, which do not disturb the Peace of the Kingdom; And that we shall be ready to

¹¹⁴⁹ Roger L'Estrange, *The Reformed Catholique: Or, The True Protestant* (London, 1679), pp. 1 – 2.

consent to such an Act of Parliament, as upon mature Deliberation shall be offered to us for the full granting that indulgence:¹¹⁵⁰

However clear this may have seemed to an inexperienced young king on verge of returning home, it appeared far more opaque to many of his subjects, particularly those of a more apocalyptic orientation. Over the next few years, further royal declarations on religion worked hard to clarify the king's original intent. The most consistent theme across these declarations was the king's key qualification that religion should 'not disturb the Peace of the Kingdom'. But others heard what they wanted to hear; nonconformists latched onto the language of toleration, and the wider nation was soon embroiled in renewed debates about whether, how, and why there should be a reformation of both the episcopate and the Book of Common Prayer. In the early 1660s, the wider public was inundated with dozens of pamphlets on point.

There was, however, an important difference between these familiar debates and those that took place in the 1640s under Charles I. Unlike his father, Charles II had taken the Solemn League and Covenant. This was done in an attempt to win back the throne the previous decade; although taken under duress, which rendered the validity of the king's oath invalid,¹¹⁵¹ his Presbyterian supporters wasted no time arguing against their that Charles II was a covenanted king. They expected that he would either allow some sort of religious toleration of Presbyterianism, or that he would defend the Solemn League and Covenant in full and make England a Presbyterian nation. Episcopalians countered that the king had used the Book of Common Prayer while in exile, and they consequently expected a restoration of both the episcopate and the liturgy. These debates continued until 1662, when the Book of Common Prayer was revised and episcopal authority strengthened, thus closing—bitterly for a small

¹¹⁵⁰ Charles II, *Declaration* (Edinburgh, 1660).

¹¹⁵¹ Ronald Hutton, *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 47 – 8.

minority, but joyfully for the vast majority of the population—more than a century of acrimonious political and religious argument in the British kingdoms. Only after this did a historical discourse about the English Reformation, which saw its first flowering under and against Cromwell, finally enter full bloom.

II.

Between 1660 and 1662, three perspectives on episcopacy were advanced and debated. The first held that episcopacy was by divine law (*iure divino*) and should be restored as it had existed under Charles I. The convocations of York and Canterbury would thus resume their legislative roles just as the bishops would be free to resume the headship of their respective dioceses. Opposite this were the Presbyterians and Independents, each of whom remained firmly opposed to episcopacy but held that their own, respective ecclesiologies were also *iure divino*. A third position was variously termed ‘reformed’ or ‘reduced’ episcopacy, a term that came from Archbishop James Ussher, whose study of early Christianity concluded that bishops and presbyters originally worked together in a synod. In a short paper entitled *The Reduction of Episcopacie*, Ussher proposed reorganizing the Church of England into a twofold synodical structure. Each diocese would have a ‘*Diocesan Synod*’ that met ‘once or twice in the year’ and consisted of the diocesan bishop, any bishops suffragan, and all priests.¹¹⁵² A ‘*Provincial Synod*’, which Ussher recommended should meet triennially, would include all Archbishops, bishops, and bishops suffragan, and ‘such other of the Clergy as should be elected out of every Diocese within the Province’.¹¹⁵³ A small number of Presbyterians looked upon Ussher’s proposal as one way of achieving their desired goals of curbing the power of bishops. Like St. Jerome, Peter

¹¹⁵² James Ussher, *The Reduction of Episcopacie* (London, 1656), p. 6.

¹¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6 – 7.

Lombard, and his own Presbyterian contemporaries, Ussher held that Christians lacked a clear distinction between bishops and presbyters for many centuries.¹¹⁵⁴ However, because the *Reduction* retained both a diocesan structure and the episcopal hierarchy, including Archbishops, it would be unfair to portray the *Reduction* as a clear middle way between Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism.

Recent scholarship has tended to emphasize the distinction between these three ecclesiological groups,¹¹⁵⁵ but such nuanced division, however clear to modern historians, seems to have been lost on contemporaries, who largely blurred the two episcopalian positions together. This resulted in the use of simple labels such as ‘the Episcopal party’ by participants on all sides in this debate.¹¹⁵⁶ Because Independents looked upon all episcopacy as unacceptable, and because Presbyterians were divided over reformed episcopacy, it was not uncommon for all to lump together as one group the supportive but divergent views on episcopal hierarchy. This general lack of nuance may have been influenced by the political realities that developed between Charles II’s return in 1660 and the beginning of the Cavalier parliament the following year. The restoration of the Church of England entailed the restoration of episcopacy, but this directly confronted the legal strictures against bishops since 1643, when the Solemn League and Covenant had directly advocated for the total abolition of episcopacy and the transformation of the national church into a Presbyterian establishment. Although the Presbyterian coup failed, Oliver Cromwell never sought to reinstate bishops, and during the 1650s most bishops lived in either hiding or exile. In 1660, questions about the authority of returning bishops were at once

¹¹⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 2 – 3.

¹¹⁵⁵ See, e.g., N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Blackwell Publishing, 2002), pp. 109 – 15; Jacqueline Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660 – 1688* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 129 – 62.

¹¹⁵⁶ E.g., John Rowland, *A Reply to the Answer of Anonymus* (London, 1660), p. 11; H. S., *Reasons Shewing that There is No Need of Such a Reformation* (London, 1660), p. 18; Philip Nye, *Beames of Former Light* (London, 1660), pp. 174, 194, 197; Salem Philalathes, *The Moderate Independent Proposing a Word in Season to the Gathered Churches* (London, 1660), pp. 3, 14, 18, 31 – 3.

also questions about the long-term legal authority of the revolutionary regimes of the civil wars and Interregnum. If the bishops were to be restored, then the laws passed by the Rump Parliament had to be overturned.

As older theological debates about episcopacy also resumed, they were shaped by these legal debates. A good example of this is John Gauden's short tract *ANALYSIS* (Analysis), which initiated a substantive pamphlet war in the months that followed.¹¹⁵⁷ Written as a letter dated June 12, 1660, and subtitled *The Loosing of St. Peters Bands*, Gauden sought to answer a simple question: what should be done with the Solemn League and Covenant, which Presbyterians claimed was still binding upon the entire nation? With the Restoration, bishops had not only returned to England or come out of hiding, but they had also been enthusiastically received by a large portion of the population. Many even returned to work in the cathedrals. Treating his question as an issue of casuistry, Gauden argued that the Covenant was not binding for two reasons. First, in terms of politics, Charles I was a 'martyr'¹¹⁵⁸ and the Covenant was 'watered with the Kings blood'.¹¹⁵⁹ Its coercive origins and propagation were an *ipso facto* disqualification of its legal status. Drawing upon a line of apologetic as old as James I's argument against the Millenary Petition, Gauden emphasized that the authors of the Covenant had pledged their loyalty to Charles I but later turned against him. He further alleged that those who supported the Covenant in 1660 were no different than those who drafted it in 1643; neither they nor their stated claims could be trusted. Given the political outcome of the civil wars, Gauden believed that no one should feel burdened in their conscience for rejecting the Covenant.

A second reason for rejecting the Covenant was theological, and was due to Gauden's own commitment to episcopacy. He wrote,

¹¹⁵⁷ John Gauden, *ANALYSIS. The Loosing of St. Peters Bands* (London, 1660).

¹¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

if the *Covenant* were designed, as willfully exclusive and *totally abjuring* of all *Episcopal order and Government* in this Church of *England*, it must needs run us upon a *great rock* not only of *Novelty* but of *Schism*, and dash us both in opinion and *practice* against the *judgement* and *custom* of the *Catholick Church*, in all places and ages (till of later years) from the Apostles days, with whom we ought to keep *communion* in all things of so ancient *tradition*, and *universal observation*.¹¹⁶⁰

On the one hand, this was an uncompromising affirmation of episcopacy, which Gauden—like so many before him, all the way back to Archbishop Cranmer—traced to apostolic times. On the other hand, Gauden used his *ANALYSIS* to advocate for an alteration in prior episcopal practice. Referencing Archbishop Ussher's *Reduction*, Gauden advocated a '*primitive, reformed, and regular* Episcopacy, so reduced to an efficacious conjunction with Presbytery'.¹¹⁶¹ He hoped that reformed episcopacy would bring bishops into a closer working relationship with the priests under them. Presumably, it would also bring moderate Presbyterians into the episcopal church, thereby securing not just greater national unity, but a decreased likelihood that they would join with their more militant coreligionists to overthrow the monarchy and/or the Church of England. The theological and the political buttressed one another as Gauden worked for an uncontested but peaceful restoration of the Church of England.

Charles II also participated in these debates. When he issued his Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs on 25 October 1660, the king echoed Gauden's support for a reduced episcopacy that would mollify moderate Presbyterians and incorporate them into the national church. This declaration is often read as indicating Charles II's good nature and broadly inclusive approach to religion, but it can also be read as an attempt at dividing Dissenters from

¹¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

¹¹⁶¹ Ibid., p. 14.

within. If moderate Presbyterians were incorporated into the Church of England, they would not only be free from suspicions of religious heterodoxy, but from accusations of civil disobedience as well. With moderates divided into ‘the Episcopal party’, Dissenters who were committed enemies of church and state would be more clearly defined. The king began his Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs by underscoring the broad claim that civil and ecclesiastical peace were interrelated and mutually dependent: ‘How much the Peace of the State is concerned with the Peace of the Church, and how difficult a thing it is to preserve Order and Government in Civil, whilst there is no Order or Government in Ecclesiastical Affairs, is evident to the World’.¹¹⁶² His statements and sentiments were commonplaces of the time period, but Charles II did more here than just repeat a truism. In many ways, his declaration can be read as a gloss upon the Declaration of Breda. The king apparently felt the need to clarify his earlier promise of ‘a Liberty to Tender Consciences’, and he used his new declaration to expressly emphasize that the litmus test for toleration was ‘the Peace of the Kingdom’.¹¹⁶³ Political peace was the conceptual cornerstone of the king’s religious policy.

The king’s civil commitments carried with them an important corollary: he did not consider the bulk of complaints against the Church of England to be serious enough to justify religious diversity. Turning to specifically theological matters, Charles II summarized for his readers ‘the experience We have had in most of the Reformed Churches abroad’.¹¹⁶⁴ Directly countering long-standing anti-episcopal appeals to ‘the best reformed churches’ in Europe, the king explained to the nation that he, ‘to Our great Satisfaction and Comfort found them [Reformed Christians] Persons full of Affection to Us, of Zeal for the Peace of the Church and

¹¹⁶² Charles II, *Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs*, reprinted in *A Collection of His Majestie’s Gracious Letters, Speeches, Messages, and Declarations since April 4/14 1660* (London), p. 86.

¹¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

¹¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

State, and neither Enemies (as they have been given out to be) to Episcopacy, or Liturgy, but modestly to desire such alterations in either, as without shaking the Foundations, might best allay the present distempers'.¹¹⁶⁵ Securing civil peace was the king's goal, but as the rest of the Declaration made clear, he expected to secure peace within a broadly liturgical and episcopalian religious settlement. Charles II's ecclesiastical policy consisted of eight points. The first six concerned episcopacy, while the seventh and eighth concerned the liturgy and liturgical devotion. The third point could have come directly out of Ussher's *Reduction*: 'No Bishop shall Ordain, or exercise any part of Jurisdiction which appertains to the Censures of the Church, without the advice and assistance of the Presbyters'.¹¹⁶⁶ This was a concession to moderate Presbyterians, and the king's approach to contested liturgical matters was, within the framework of his own commitment to liturgy, equally conciliatory. In his seventh point, Charles II promised to 'appoint an equal number of Learned Divines of both Perswasions, to re-view the same'.¹¹⁶⁷ In his eighth point, the king insisted that traditional liturgical devotion should be allowed as 'most humble, most devout',¹¹⁶⁸ but not enforced upon those who found such practices unconscionable. However, as in the Declaration of Breda, the king also made it clear that these concessions were temporary and that they would be determined in the near future by 'a National Synod, which shall be duly called, after a little time'.¹¹⁶⁹ Charles II concluded his declaration as he began it: with a clearly stated demand for peace in church and state, and an equally clear censure upon any who used sermons 'to disturb the Peace of the Kingdom.'¹¹⁷⁰

¹¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 90.

¹¹⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 102 – 3 (mispaginated as pp. 92 – 3).

¹¹⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 109 (mispaginated as p. 99).

¹¹⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 112 (mispaginated as p. 102).

¹¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 113 (mispaginated as p. 103).

¹¹⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 119 (mispaginated as p. 109).

The Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs was hardly vague, but because it deferred to a future date any final decision on contested matters, it courted continued debate about both liturgy and episcopacy. As diverse pamphleteers joined the rising cacophony of voices, older works were reprinted that linked current debate with that of the 1640s. The Solemn League and Covenant was reprinted in 1660, as was a new edition of the University of Oxford's 1647 refutation of the same.¹¹⁷¹ In 1660, the longtime royalist printer Richard Royston posthumously published a small collection of works by Daniel Featley, a chaplain to Charles I, including a short defense of episcopacy and a lengthy rejection of the Solemn League and Covenant.¹¹⁷² Across these works, some arguments appeared repeatedly. Like Peter Heylyn, Featley identified Presbyterians with a fourth-century heretic named Aerius, who denied the authority of bishops.¹¹⁷³ The *Reasons* of the Oxford heads did the same.¹¹⁷⁴ Although Gauden did not explicitly connect Presbyterians with the Aerian heresy, he did write generally against 'sacrilegious Protestants' in the *ANALYSIS*.¹¹⁷⁵ Charles II also deployed no specific heresiological discourse, but as noted above, he defended the antiquity of the liturgical practices so disliked by Dissenters. There was no place for doubting the king's own ecclesiastical commitments. The question was whether or not, following the lead of Parliament, he would impose the Church of England's religious practice upon the small but vocal—and potentially violent—ecclesiastical minorities.

Because the king refused to impose an ecclesiastical decision by royal fiat, more extreme solutions to religious division made their way into the popular press. Some went so far as to

¹¹⁷¹ The University of Oxford, *Reasons of the Present Judgment of the University of Oxford* (London, 1660).

¹¹⁷² Daniel Featley, *The League Illegal* (London, 1660).

¹¹⁷³ Ibid., pp. 29, 52, 58. Aerius should not be confused with Arius, who also lived in the fourth century but denied the divinity of Christ.

¹¹⁷⁴ The University of Oxford, *Reasons*, pp. 8 – 9.

¹¹⁷⁵ Gauden, *ANALYSIS*, p. 14.

argue for the imposition of a fully Presbyterian system upon the English nation. A good example of this comes from the end of 1660, when the Presbyterian minister and controversialist Zachary Crofton published his *ANAAHPIS* (*Analepsis*; the Greek refers to fixing a bandage or restoring a bond). It was a popular pamphlet, and went through three editions in 1660 and a fourth in 1661. Although framed as an attack upon Gauden's *ANAAYΣIΣ*, Crofton made no distinction between 'reduced' episcopacy and its less synodical form. His work thus carried an implicit rejection of the solution offered by Charles II's Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs. Crofton denied that bishops and presbyters were distinct in either order or office, and he took especial umbrage at the phrase 'paternal authority', which Gauden had used to describe episcopal authority both in the *ANAAYΣIΣ* and in his 1659 apologetic *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspira* (The Deep Sighs of the Church of England).¹¹⁷⁶ According to Crofton, terms such as '*preheminance, prerogative, paternal power, and juridical authority*' were synonymous with '*prelacy*', '*Hierarchy*', '*Chief-Priesthood*', and '*formal Popery*'.¹¹⁷⁷ As an alternative, he proposed a Presbyterian ecclesial organization that rejected the existence of archbishops and limited the role of bishops to administrative matters within a common council of Presbyters ('*communi concilio Presbyterorum*'). He termed this 'Presbyterial Episcopacy'.¹¹⁷⁸ Such arguments were not new—Crofton commented that 'the removal of *Englands* Hierarchy hath been sued for from Queen Elizabeths time, downward unto this day'¹¹⁷⁹—but the *ANAAHPIS* also revealed the influence of Caroline theological debate. One of these was Milton's contention that bishops were enemies of reformation. The other was the historical apologetic, most developed by episcopalian royalists such as Peter Heylyn, that the sixteenth century had seen a distinct even termed *the* Reformation.

¹¹⁷⁶ Zachary Crofton, *ANAAHPIS* (London, 1660), p. 4; cf. John Gauden, *ANAAYΣIΣ*, p. 18, and idem., *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspira* (London, 1659), p. 533.

¹¹⁷⁷ Crofton, *ANAAHPIS*, p. 5.

¹¹⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 6.

¹¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

Crofton sounded a note of Elizabethan-era discord by writing, ‘happy is that Church whose Reformation carrieth them furthest off *Romes* Superstition, in discipline, and worship, as well as doctrine.’¹¹⁸⁰ According to Crofton, this movement toward the total rejection of all things papal began in the sixteenth century during the reign of Edward VI and continued on under Elizabeth, but was little aided by episcopacy. A series of rhetorical questions were intended to hammer the point home.

wherein hath not Episcopacie (by *its silencing and suspending zealous Ministers, excommunicating, imprisoning, banishing, and stigmatizing pious Christians, for no fault at all save endeavouring it*) retarded the progress and perfection of the Reformation? nay, hath not Episcopacie (by *its turning our Chancels into railed insancta sanctorums* [unholy holy places], *our Communion-tables into adored Altars, our glass windows into popish pictures, and changing our common and established Liturgy into a more compleat conformity to the Popish Mass-book for form of administration, Order of worship, Rites and Ceremonies*) brought the *Reformation* into a most palpable and apparent Retrogradation?¹¹⁸¹

The first set of parenthetical remarks may have been intended to refer primarily to events in Elizabethan England, and the second set of parenthetical remarks was likely intended to describe events in Caroline England. Archbishop Whitgift was associated with the former, and Archbishop Laud with the latter. However, as earlier chapters have shown, such liturgical developments encompassed the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles. By defining reformation as opposition to such practices, and by defining *the* Reformation as the first sixteenth-century expression of this same opposition, Crofton could easily portray bishops as the principle

¹¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 19.

¹¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 31.

opponents of ‘reformation’ no less than ‘*the* Reformation’. Crofton effectively used the semantic slippage between the common noun and the proper noun to create an all-encompassing argument, and concluded that nothing was more necessary for English Christianity than ‘*the honest and ingenuous Reformation of Episcopacie*’.¹¹⁸²

All of these arguments were very old, but their importance was exacerbated by the fact that Charles II had adopted of the Solemn League and Covenant in 1650. Every defense of episcopacy was also an attack on the Covenant, but if the Covenant was still binding, defenses of episcopacy could be read—or at least framed—as attacks upon Charles II as a covenanted king. Crofton made several references to Charles II in his *ANAAHPIS*,¹¹⁸³ and this forced both Gauden and his supporters to address the issue. As we will later see, around 95% of the English population returned to and remained in the Church of England, but Crofton cast this statistical reality aside and bluntly declared that although Presbyterians were in the minority, ‘their confidence may be the greater, for that His most *Sacred Majesty* comes in to make up the number.’¹¹⁸⁴ This in turn made the Covenant a matter of ‘National Obligation’,¹¹⁸⁵ such that opposition to the Covenant was opposition to the king himself.¹¹⁸⁶ Crofton’s legal arguments were buoyed by two contestable assumptions. The first concerned whether Parliament’s adoption of the Covenant was legally binding. His second assumption concerned Charles II. Never once did Crofton consider that the king’s acceptance of the Covenant was coerced rather than voluntary. In truth, Charles II took the Covenant under duress, and during his exile in Europe rarely acceded to Presbyterian scruples.¹¹⁸⁷ When he finally returned to England, he immediately

¹¹⁸² Ibid., p. 35.

¹¹⁸³ Ibid., pp. 17, 26 – 7, 30, and 36.

¹¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 26.

¹¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 27.

¹¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 36.

¹¹⁸⁷ Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 47 – 8 (on his taking the Covenant), 50 (on tensions with Presbyterians over his household), 72 and 148 (on his use of Anglican rites), 90 – 1 (on tensions between Anglicans and Presbyterians at

set about restoring the episcopate and reportedly said that he trusted Catholics more than Presbyterians.¹¹⁸⁸ The idea that Charles II was a happily or loyally covenanted king had little grounding.

Negative responses to Crofton deployed a variety of arguments against the Covenant. Importantly, none of these authors seriously considered the possibility that Charles II had validly taken the Covenant. John Gauden proposed that the wider English nation was not bound by the Covenant until subscribed to by Charles II, together with the Lords and the Commons.¹¹⁸⁹ According to the Episcopalian clergyman John Rowland, the legality of the Covenant was suspect for multiple reasons: because only a ‘faction’ in Parliament took it, because violence surrounded its adoption, and because Charles I, as both king and executive, had rejected it.¹¹⁹⁰ An anonymously authored pamphlet similarly emphasized the importance of both royal authority and royal consent for the Covenant to be binding, and the corresponding lack thereof during the reign of Charles I.¹¹⁹¹ At a more popular and pastoral level, however, such nuance was not necessary. As these debates wore on, the Church of England continued restoring its hierarchy by consecrating five new bishops in Westminster Abbey on 28 October 1660. In his consecration sermon, John Sudbury took as his text St. Paul’s exhortation that ‘This is a true saying, If a man desire the Office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work.’¹¹⁹² Sudbury repeated many familiar

his exiled court), 122 (on his regular religious practice, including weekly fasting), 141 – 2 (on his arrest of the leading Scottish Covenanters); cf. pp. 59 – 60, which discusses Charles II’s use of the Covenants to further secure Scottish loyalty.

¹¹⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 149, 148.

¹¹⁸⁹ Anonymous and John Gauden, *Certain Scruples and Doubts of Conscience about Taking the Solemne League and Covenant* (London, 1660), sig. A2r – v.

¹¹⁹⁰ John Rowland, *A Reply to the Answer of Anonymus*, pp. 4 (faction), 4 – 5 (violence), 17, 23, and 43 (royal authority).

¹¹⁹¹ Anonymous, *Certain Scruples and Doubts of Conscience*, esp. p. 13 nn. 1 – 2.

¹¹⁹² John Sudbury, *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Fathers in God* (London, 1660), p. 1.

points; he emphasized the heresy of Aerius and thus non-episcopal Christians,¹¹⁹³ stressed the mutual relationship between church and state,¹¹⁹⁴ and flatly averred without qualification that ‘a *Christian* cannot be a *Rebell*, but he must depart from his *Faith* and turn *infidel*, if not in *word*, yet in *deed*.’¹¹⁹⁵ Such parochial clarity did not need to wait upon the determinations of casuistical divinity or legal deliberations.

As 1660 gave way to 1661, even conciliatory episcopalians like John Gauden and Charles II became increasingly obdurate in their respective defenses of the Church of England. This may have been a response to the surge of religious violence, much of which was animated and justified through appeals to the Solemn League and Covenant. In particular, the king’s enemies accused him of having forsaken the Covenant.¹¹⁹⁶ The months following Charles’s return saw a small number of unsuccessful attempts at overthrowing the restored regime, but the most influential and disconcerting rebellion took place on Epiphany (6 January) 1660/1, when the Fifth Monarchist Thomas Venner led an uprising that targeted both the Church of England and the monarchy.¹¹⁹⁷ Animated by the apocalyptic hope that ‘King Jesus’ would return upon their victory, the Fifth Monarchists published a manifesto entitled *A Door of Hope*, in which they described the regicide of Charles I as the ‘beginning of Reformation’.¹¹⁹⁸ Declaring that ‘The Controversie now therefore lies between *Zion* and *Babylon*, between Christ and Antichrist’, Venner and his associates divided just as sharply between those ‘whoso hath a heart to appear for God, for his Christ, for Reformation, Justice, and Righteousness, for the Cause of Truth, and for the good People of these Nations’, and those who were guilty of supporting ‘Popery, Prelacy,

¹¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 12 – 13.

¹¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹¹⁹⁶ Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660 – 1663* (Oxford University Press, 1986), e.g., pp. 23, 46.

¹¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, *Deliver us from Evil*, pp. 50 – 65.

¹¹⁹⁸ Anonymous, *A Door of Hope* (London, 1660), p. 1.

Common-Prayer, Organs, Superstitions, false, prophane forms of Worship, Idolatrous, Ceremonial, Typical, Antichristian shadows and vanities...and such whorish trash and Trinkery, Altars, Bowing, Kneeling, and Worshipping a piece of Wood and Bread, and a Wax candle (a filthy base Idol) for the true God'.¹¹⁹⁹ The evils identified by *A Door of Hope* did not stop here, and still later in the manifesto, Charles II was named 'a profest Enemy, a Rebel and Traytor to Christ.'¹²⁰⁰ It is unknown how many men associated themselves with Venner, but the uprising and consequent murder of several soldiers set the nation on edge. In late 1660, an apocalyptically-fueled and militant reformation remained a distinct possibility.

The government wasted no time in responding. At the behest of Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, Charles II issued a proclamation against conventicles on 10 January that began with reference to the Declaration of Breda. The king lamented that 'nothing can be more unwelcome to Us, then the necessity of restreyning some part of that Liberty which was indulged to tender Consciences by Our late gracious Declaration'. However, the king named Anabaptists, Quakers, and Fifth-Monarchy-men as operating 'under pretence of serving God' in order to affect 'the disturbance of the publique Peace by Insurrection and Murther'. Charles II described such groups as 'those persons who have presumed to make so ill an use of our Indulgence', and then banned their right to meet in any kind of religious assembly.¹²⁰¹ Government intervention could not bring theological argumentation to an end, but it could create a legal framework in which certain kinds of religious practices were endorsed or at least allowed, and others declared illegal and thus punishable. The Solemn League and Covenant became an especial target. Several months after Venner's uprising, when Zachary Crofton continued his

¹¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

¹²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

¹²⁰¹ Charles II, *A Proclamation, Prohibiting all unlawful and Seditious Meetings and Conventicles under pretence of Religious Worship* (London, 1660).

defense the Covenant by publishing yet another attack upon Gauden and episcopacy, he was accused of treason and consigned to the Tower.¹²⁰² The Cavalier Parliament, which began on 8 May 1661, took matters still further by restoring the bishops to their traditional place in the House of Lords. In doing so, Parliament was finally reconstituted to the state it had before the outbreak of the civil wars. When the House of Commons voted to burn the Solemn League and Covenant, the king did not protest. In early May 1661, the restored government was just shy of its one-year anniversary, but its legal decisions had fundamentally altered England's civil and ecclesiastical landscape. There was now no question about the continued existence of both bishops and the Book of Common Prayer.

If Charles II began changing his approach to dissent after Venner's failed uprising, John Gauden began changing his approach in *A Pillar of Gratitude*, a response to the Cavalier Parliament's restoration of the Lords Spiritual. After celebrating 'The happy Restauration of full and fre Parliaments', Gauden offered a detailed defense of episcopacy and its importance in the history of English Christianity.¹²⁰³ Naming many excellent bishops from Anglo-Saxon and Norman times all the way down to his own, Gauden's *Pillar* was both prescriptive and polemical; it was, in many ways, a work of heresiology. This made it a very different work than the *ANAΛYΣΙΣ*. Early in the text, Gauden divided sharply between 'Usurping Presbyters' and 'Orthodox Clergy'.¹²⁰⁴ The former he now compared with both Aerianism and Islam,¹²⁰⁵ and he described the 1650s as an era akin to persecution endured by the early Church.¹²⁰⁶ Meanwhile, the terms 'Orthodox', 'Reformed', 'Catholic', and 'Christian' were all used synonymously as

¹²⁰² Greaves, *Deliver us from Evil*, pp. 211 – 12; E. C. Vernon, 'Crofton, Zachary (1626–1672)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/6724>, accessed 22 July 2015].

¹²⁰³ John Gauden, *A Pillar of Gratitude* (London, 1660), p. 2.

¹²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 32 (Aerianism), 33 (Islam).

¹²⁰⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 12 – 13.

descriptors of the Church of England.¹²⁰⁷ Gauden went so far as to describe episcopacy as ‘divinely constituted’.¹²⁰⁸ Perhaps drawing upon Elizabethan polemics, he described Presbyterians as ‘zealous Pretenders to *Reformation*’¹²⁰⁹ whose actions led to nothing but anarchy.¹²¹⁰ Most importantly, he freely and frequently deployed popular conceptions of monstrosity. Describing his opponents as both ‘deformed’ and ‘deforming’,¹²¹¹ he mixed his metaphors and wrote, ‘At length they all *nestled* themselves under the popular *Shadow*, or in the spreading *Branches* of an Anti-episcopal, novel, illegal and Headless *Presbytery*’.¹²¹² Later descriptions in the *Pillar* compared Non-conformity with ‘the teeth, tail, and sting of a *Dragon*’, and with the apocalyptic beasts described in the Biblical book of Daniel.¹²¹³ However different from the *ANAYΣIZ*, the tenor of the *Pillar* rapidly became the wider tenor of the nation. By mid-1661, the reformation intended by the Solemn League and Covenant had become the preserve of a small but sometimes militant minority.

III.

Liturgy was just as contentious as episcopacy. A number of earlier works in support of the Church of England were reprinted in the early 1660s. William Barlow’s account of the Hampton Court Conference reappeared in 1661. The complete works of Richard Hooker appeared in 1662 and saw three further editions printed through 1684. On the opposite side, the Directory of Public Worship was republished in 1660, and the original 1641 pamphlet by Smectymnuus was republished as *Smectymnuus Redivivus*. Reaching beyond the 1640s by going

¹²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 8; see also, pp. 31, 39, 59, 61.

¹²⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 35.

¹²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 17; see also pp. 25, 50.

¹²¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 7, 18, 52, 53.

¹²¹¹ Ibid., pp. 18, 46.

¹²¹² Ibid., p. 18.

¹²¹³ Ibid., pp. 46 – 7.

back to the sixteenth century, a collection of letters by John Calvin, Theodore Beza, and other Swiss and Scots theologians was published in 1660 as *The Judgment of Foreign Divines*. Intended, like the Directory and *Smectymnuus Redivivus*, to buttress arguments against vestments and the Book of Common Prayer more generally, *The Judgment of Foreign Divines* was reprinted in 1690 but otherwise proved to be the last publication of writings by Calvin or Beza in England until the eighteenth century.¹²¹⁴ In England, *Smectymnuus Redivivus* was published in 1661 and then again in 1680, but the Directory was not printed again.¹²¹⁵

On 5 March 1660/1, after nearly nine months in England, Charles II issued his ‘*Proclamation for Authorizing an uniformity of the Book of Common-Prayer, to be used throughout the REALM.*’ Intended as a follow-up to his Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, it too attempted to clarify the religious content found in the Declaration of Breda. Charles II’s basic narrative read like that of the original Hampton Court Conference. After referencing the statements on religion found in his earlier declarations, the king sounded a less conciliatory note by recounting how, upon his return to England, he was ‘entertained & importuned with Informations of sundry Ministers, complaining of the Errors & Imperfections of the Church here, as well in matters of Doctrine, as of Discipline’. Like his grandfather James, the recently restored king had no sympathy with such complaints, and he described the accuracy of Dissenters’ allegations as ‘pretended’. Like other episcopalians, the king looked back to the reign

¹²¹⁴ Alexander Cunningham published *An Essay Concerning Church Government* (London, 1689), a brief collection of excerpts out of the writings of Calvin and Beza. The work was reprinted in 1692. Cunningham used a second set of excerpts from both authors in *The Divine Right of Episcopacy* (London, 1690). Both of Cunningham’s pamphlets were pro-episcopalian treatises directed against Presbyterians. French editions of Beza’s work on the Psalms were printed in 1722 and 1728, the latter of which also contained Calvin’s order of service. An edition of Beza’s poems appeared in 1713, but nothing else by him was printed in eighteenth-century England. The fate of Calvin’s writings was much the same. In 1719, the second edition of a treatise containing excerpts by Luther and Calvin on the Trinity was printed in London. In Glasgow, the *Institution of the Christian Religion* appeared in 1762, but nothing else by Calvin appeared in Britain until 1797, when his commentary on James was printed in Aberdeen.

¹²¹⁵ It was, however, printed in Scotland in 1693; an edition was also brought forth in 1694, but the title page contained neither the printer’s name nor the place of publication.

of Elizabeth as the standard by which to measure the kingdom, and he sought to reinstate the Tudor queen's golden age in his own time: 'We had seen the kingdom under that form of Religion which by Law was established in the dayes of the late *Queen* of famous memory, blessed with peace & prosperity, both extraordinary, and of many years continuance, (a strong evidence that God was therewith well pleased)'. Those who rejected 'that form of Religion which by Law was established'—in other words, the Book of Common Prayer—were guilty of 'presuming more of Our intents than ever We gave them cause to do'. Dissenters 'held Assemblies without Authority, and did other things carrying a very shew of Sedition more than zeal'. The conciliatory king was becoming less patient and more suspicious.

Charles II then proceeded to recount his own recent Hampton Court conference. Like that which took place in 1603/4, this meeting also happened in January, and it too involved both Dissenters and the leading bishops and theologians of the Church of England. Regrettably, we do not have a transcript of what took place, but because of his presence and participation, Charles II knew first hand the kinds of arguments used against the Book of Common Prayer. He was apparently unimpressed, and in his Proclamation condemned Dissenters for relying upon 'so weak & slender proofs'. In the end, the king had neither toleration nor sympathy for those who rejected the liturgy, and he began the final paragraph of his declaration with a zero-sum command: 'Wherefore We require all Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and all publick Ministers, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil, to do their duty in causing the same to be obeyed, and in punishing the offenders according to the Laws of the Realm heretofore established, for the authorizing of the said Book of *Common-Prayer*.'¹²¹⁶ Having preserved episcopacy and liturgy in his Proclamation Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, Charles II now aimed at preserving—and, where necessary,

¹²¹⁶ Charles II, 'A *Proclamation* for Authorizing an uniformity of the Book of *Common-Prayer*, to be used throughout the REALM' (London, 1660).

enforcing—conformity. In the face of resistance and sporadic violence, the seemingly expansive toleration promised on 4/14 April 1660 was shrinking. The king's good will was, too.

John Gauden involved himself in liturgical controversies as well, and his 1661 pamphlet *Considerations Touching the Liturgy of the Church of England* also set off a larger pamphlet war involving, among others, Zachary Crofton. The cover of Gauden's *Considerations* stated that the pamphlet was 'In reference to *His Majesties* late Gracious Declaration, And in order to an happy UNION in *Church and State*.' As in the debate over episcopacy, this debate was a public contest over Charles II's image as much as it was a debate about the content of the liturgy itself. Gauden began his work by denying that Charles II intended any disrespect to the Book of Common Prayer in his earlier Declaration of Breda.

His Majesties design in that *indulgent Declaration*, was not to shew any *disaffection* or *disesteem* in *His Majesty* toward the ancient and excellent *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*, which was His companion and consort in all His distresses, and which still is the daily rule and measure of *His Majesties* publique Devotions; as it hath been of His *Royal Fathers*, of blessed memory, and all His *Princely Progenitors* since the *Reformation*.¹²¹⁷

The Reformation, which was maintained by Charles II through the Book of Common Prayer, contrasted with the '*Faction* and *Confusion*, *Tyranny* and *Anarchy*' that existed 'under the pretensions of *Liberty* and *Reformation*' during the 1640s and 1650s.¹²¹⁸ Like so many other members of 'the Episcopal party', Gauden had a strongly pronounced conception of false reformation, which he compared with sedition later in the same text. 'As is apparent in the late *inordinate zealotries*, and desperate frolicks of Religion; which under *pretence* of some mens

¹²¹⁷ John Gauden, *Considerations Touching the Liturgy* (London, 1661), p. 1; Gauden maintained this line of discussion through p. 4, and returned to it later as well (pp. 38 and 42).

¹²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

various & vertiginous *Reformations*, contrary to our laws, no lesse then against the will, command and conscience of the King, run themselves with this famous and flourishing Church and Kingdomes into most miserable confusions'.¹²¹⁹ False reformation gave Charles I 'the honour of Christian Martyrdome', and the liturgy for which he died was 'the best, of any *ancient*, or *modern*, that I ever saw.'¹²²⁰ These two divergent reformations—that pursued by sixteenth-century monarchs, and that pursued by seventeenth-century parliamentarians—led either to liturgy and order, or to a total lack thereof.

Gauden's *Considerations* consisted of two facets. First, addressing Charles II's concerns for peace, Gauden argued that a unified liturgy would aid the unity of church and state. Looking back to the early church, he argued that one of the primary purposes of liturgy was to keep 'all the *members* of the same Church and polity in one holy *harmony*, and to secure the unity of *Faith* and *Doctrine*'. Unity encompassed moral teaching and obligations as well, because liturgy preserved 'the *sanctity* and *solemnity* of Holy duties from the *contagion* and *deformity* of private Ministers frequent infirmities'.¹²²¹ Once established and enjoined within the framework of a national church structure, all churchgoers would participate in shared moral formation. This was especially true of those 'poor Boys and Girls'¹²²² who had no memory of the Book of Common Prayer and the religious unity so desired by Charles II, Gauden, and others. Second, Gauden trumpeted the antiquity of the theology, polity, and liturgy of the Church of England. He recognized that the Book of Common Prayer was like the Roman Missal in some respects, but only because both 'had taken and retained after the *forme of the ancient Liturgy of the Church*'. In the sixteenth century, 'our wise *Reformers*' removed '*Romish corruption in Doctrine*' and

¹²¹⁹ Ibid., p. 29.

¹²²⁰ Ibid., pp. 30.

¹²²¹ Ibid., pp. 8 – 9.

¹²²² Ibid., p. 11.

‘*Superstition in Devotion*’, thus enabling the English liturgy to ‘conforme to pious and unspotted Antiquity’. Everything retained by the Church of England was ‘above a *thousand* years old’.¹²²³ Gauden’s apologetic for the Book of Common Prayer tended, like all earlier such apologetics, in a single direction: antiquity. Charles II had similarly used antiquity to defend bowing at the name of Jesus in the Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs. Articulated amidst calls for political peace and religious closure, antiquity and stability became synonymous in the political discourses that defined the public culture of the early Restoration.

On 25 March 1661, Charles II appointed a group of bishops to meet with Presbyterian clergy and ‘an equal number of Learned Divines, of both Perswasions’ to discuss possible reforms to the Book of Common Prayer.¹²²⁴ Their meeting, which began 15 April and took place in London at the Savoy Palace, has subsequently been known as the Savoy Conference. The king extended invitations only to Presbyterians and Episcopalians; Independents were excluded, thus bracketing out the possibility that the English church might be anything other than a centralized and uniform body. Politically, the Presbyterians wholly divorced themselves from the stand taken by more radical Nonconformists. In the open letter to Charles II that prefaced *The Grand Debate*, the published version of the proceedings, the Presbyterians avowed, ‘wee must patiently submit to suffering, and every soul must bee subject to the higher Powers, for conscience sake, and not resist’.¹²²⁵ The willingness of Baxter and a small number of other Presbyterians to work with the bishops was a political commitment to using means other than violence to reach religious accord. The king’s strategy of dividing peaceable nonconformists was clearly working, and Zachary Crofton, among others, soon voiced similarly acquiescent sentiments.

¹²²³ Ibid., p. 19.

¹²²⁴ Richard Baxter, *The Grand Debate Between the most Reverend the Bishops, and the Presbyterian Divines* (London, 1661), sig. A2v.

¹²²⁵ Ibid., p. 4. *The Grand Debate* is not paginated consecutively; this open letter prefaces everything.

Otherwise, there was no unified Presbyterian front. About half of the Presbyterian representatives attended either sporadically or not at all,¹²²⁶ which undermined the persuasiveness of Presbyterian arguments while simultaneously strengthening those of the bishops and their supporters. Of those Presbyterians who did attend, few proved as influential as the clergyman Richard Baxter, who was tasked with writing down the Presbyterian complaints against the Prayer Book and a response to the bishops. In *The Grand Debate Between the most Reverend the Bishops, and the Presbyterian Divines*, Baxter published these together with an open letter to Charles II and a copy of the king's commission for the Savoy Conference. There was nothing new in the Presbyterians' complaints against the liturgy; summarized in a nineteen-point document entitled 'The Exceptions of the Presbyterian-Brethren, Against some passages in the present Liturgy', Baxter and his colleagues repeated arguments against such matters as using the word 'priest', celebrating holy days including Christmas, teaching baptismal regeneration, and kneeling to receive the sacrament. Detailed critiques of each service in the Book of Common Prayer followed.¹²²⁷ Perhaps Baxter and his associates recognized that their exceptions were old. They wrote that 'these Ceremonies have for above an hundred years been the fountain of manifold evils in this Church and Nation'.¹²²⁸ From the Presbyterian standpoint, defenders of the Book of Common Prayer were solely to blame for societal division, and Presbyterian participants even described themselves as 'far more conformable, and peaceable' than the bishops.¹²²⁹ *The Grand Debate* indicates that if there was no way to bridge the differences between the Church of

¹²²⁶ Barry Till, 'Participants in the Savoy conference (act. 1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/theme/92781>, accessed 14 July 2015].

¹²²⁷ Baxter, *The Grand Debate*, pp. 4 (holy days) and 16 (Christmas); 6, 79 – 80 (the word 'priest'); 6, 128 – 36 (baptismal regeneration); 15, 28, 90 – 3, 127 (kneeling).

¹²²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

England and the more moderate, ‘peaceable’ Presbyterians, then no middle ground would ever be found between the national church and the more violent Nonconformists.

The Presbyterian delegation situated its arguments in a distinct historical narrative. Drawing upon the historiography advanced in the 1644 *Directory for the Public Worship of God*, the second point of ‘The Exceptions’ identified Archbishop Cranmer and the other authors of the Book of Common Prayer as ‘our first Reformers’.¹²³⁰ In their eighteenth point, Baxter and company identified the canonically required vestments, the sign of the cross, and kneeling for communion as three ceremonies ‘which from the first Reformation have by sundry Learned and pious men been judged unwarrantable’.¹²³¹ By framing their appeal as a long argument deeply rooted in the Tudor past, Presbyterians prevented themselves from conceptualizing these sixteenth century events as *the* Reformation. They instead saw themselves as participants in a still-present struggle for reformation; their historical references to ‘first Reformers’ and a ‘first Reformation’ should not be separated from their call for ‘an universal Reformation’, which they defined as ‘a Liberty to use what is to their own [re: Presbyterian ministers’] Consciences most unquestionably safe, while other men use that which they like better.’¹²³² The terminological similarities between this Presbyterian work and the Episcopalian historiography of the 1650s should not obscure the far more profound differences between the two groups. For the former, reformation remained a present reality still waiting for completion; for the latter, *the* Reformation had been settled a full century prior.

The government took the bishops’ perspective, and in 1662 reissued both the Book of Common Prayer and the entirety of the Jacobean canon law. The government also published the Act of Uniformity, which all clergy were required to take under penalty of suspension from their

¹²³⁰ Ibid., p. 3.

¹²³¹ Ibid., p. 8.

¹²³² Ibid., pp. 45 – 6; p. 46 is mispaginated as p. 54.

parishes. For the next two hundred years, Anglican memory would be liturgically enacted, and canonically and legally defended according to these standards. Presbyterian concerns were summarily rejected in the new Prayer Book, and in addition to including a panoply of new holy days, the new Prayer Book also appended annual liturgies for three recent events: the failed Gunpowder Treason of 1605, the execution of Charles I, and the birth and restoration of Charles II. Although sometimes dismissed as merely ‘state services’,¹²³³ these liturgies were arguably the most important additions to the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. They collectively defined the Church of England against two foes, the first Catholic and the second Puritan, while also holding up the Church of England as the subject of divine care. All three services sounded the theme of providential protection and celebrated the Church of England’s orthodoxy. The opening prayer for the Gunpowder Treason began, ‘ALMIGHTY God, who hast in all ages shewed thy power and mercy in the miraculous and gracious deliverances of thy Church, and in the protection of righteous and religious Kings and States, professing thy holy and eternal truth, from the wicked conspiracies, and malicious practices of all the enemies thereof’.¹²³⁴ The service for the birth and restoration of Charles II thanked God, ‘who hast been exceedingly gracious unto this land, and by thy miraculous providence hast delivered us out of our late miserable confusions, by restoring to us our dread Sovereign Lord, thy servant, King CHARLES’.¹²³⁵ The king’s restoration was praised as also ‘restoring to us the publick and free profession of thy true Religion and worship, to the great comfort and joy of our hearts’.¹²³⁶ The Book of Common Prayer, with its liturgical practices and devotions, was expressly identified as ‘true Religion and worship’, and was thus set against ‘our late miserable confusions’.

¹²³³ See esp. Charles Hefling, ‘The State Services’, in Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds.), *The Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 73 – 5.

¹²³⁴ The Church of England, *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662) (Everyman’s Library, 1999), p. 610.

¹²³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 627.

¹²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 629.

Of especial note are the services of commemoration for Charles I, which were directed to be held annually on January 30. Unlike the services for the Gunpowder Treason and Restoration, services of both morning and evening prayer were commanded for Charles I. These services expressly identified his death as a ‘martyrdom’ committed ‘by wicked hands’,¹²³⁷ and praised the late king as an exemplar who followed Christ even in death:

BLESSED Lord, in whose sight the death of thy saints is precious; We magnifie thy Name for that abundant grace bestowed on our late Martyred Sovereign; by which he was enabled so chearfully to follow the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour, in a constant meek suffering of all barbarous indignities, and at last resisting unto blood; and even then, according to the same pattern, praying for his murtherers. Let his memory, O Lord, be ever blessed among us, that we may follow the example of his patience, and charity: And grant, that this our Land may be freed from the vengeance of his blood, and thy mercy glorified in the forgiveness of our sins; and all for Jesus Christ his sake. Amen.¹²³⁸

It was a prayer was as polemical as it was supplicatory, and the same can be said for the other prayers in the new services. Each of these liturgies also aimed to ritually enact communal cohesion by allowing for the celebration of Communion. The ‘state’ services were not celebrations of the English nation but defenses of the English church against those whom the liturgies expressly identified as ‘enemies’. As the November 5 liturgy also prayed, ‘cut off all such workers of iniquity, as turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction; that they may never prevail against us, or triumph the ruine of thy Church among us’.¹²³⁹ Those who participated in such prayers defined themselves against those who did not. Responsibility for the

¹²³⁷ Ibid., pp. 615, 617.

¹²³⁸ Ibid., p. 619.

¹²³⁹ Ibid., p. 611.

violence commemorated by these services was placed upon those outside of the Eucharistic community.

And so, in 1662, the Church of England split. It was a small split. Somewhere between four and six percent of the population chose to join Dissenting churches.¹²⁴⁰ Among these were a number of nonconforming ministers; in 1702, Edmund Calamy estimated that at least 2,000 ministers were ‘Ejected or Silenc’d’ between 1660 and 1662, although he argued that the number was likely closer to 2,400. Estimates since have varied, with more recent estimates at about 1,900.¹²⁴¹ This event has come to be known as the Great Ejection, although only one person at the time seems to have described it in such terms. In *Londinum Triumphans* (London Triumphant), the antiquarian William Gough wrote that in 1662, London experienced one of its ‘tragedies’ and numerous parishes ‘lost many of their beloved Pastors in that great ejection of Publick Ministers’.¹²⁴² Gough’s description does not seem to have caught on at the time. Searching the phrase ‘great ejection’ in the digital database Eighteenth Century Collections Online yields no hits. The value-laden term must have entered circulation later, long after the period of the present study.

Not all of these ministers and parishioners were forced out of the Church of England. Since Charles II’s return, small numbers of laity and ministers had begun forming their own churches. Writing from the Tower of London in 1661, Zachary Crofton penned *Reformation not Separation*, a sharp rebuke of attrition from the episcopal church. Crofton’s treatise worked on both political and theological levels. He referred to Charles I as ‘his late Majestie of honorable

¹²⁴⁰ David J. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew’s Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 37; cf. Keeble, *The Restoration*, pp. 141 – 2.

¹²⁴¹ John Seed, *Dissenting Histories: Religious Division and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England* (Edinburgh University Press, 2008), pp. 16 – 17, 36 n. 14. Calamy lists the names in *An Abridgment of Mr. Baxter’s History*, Two Vols. (London, 1713), Vol. II, pp. 846ff.

¹²⁴² William Gough, *Londinum Triumphans* (London, 1682), p. 370.

memory’,¹²⁴³ and he rebuked rebellion throughout, denying that the Solemn League and Covenant could be fairly used to justify rebellion. He feared, like many of his contemporaries, that either civil war or regicide would return: ‘our late *King-Killers*’, he complained, ‘cry up the *COVENANT*, and confound the Quarrel of the Parliament, with the *Good Old Cause*.’¹²⁴⁴ Crofton attempted to vindicate Presbyterians from all political suspicion by claiming that violent acts done in the name of the Solemn League and Covenant were ‘contrary to the literal sense, and Grammatical Construction thereof’. When Independents claimed otherwise and used the Covenant to justify rebellion, Crofton claimed that they ‘blasphemed’ it.¹²⁴⁵

Following the lead of his title, Crofton set ‘reformation’ within a constellation of other terms; it opposed both ‘separation’ and ‘superstition’, but was synonymous with ‘conservation’.¹²⁴⁶ It was also synonymous with religious unity and political peace. *Reformation not Separation* pleaded with nonconformists to recognize their duty to remain in ‘Christ’s Catholick visible Church’, a phrase that appeared with some variation several times in the treatise.¹²⁴⁷ Heresiology animated Crofton’s argument. Looking back to Robert Browne’s call for separation from the Church of England in 1582, Crofton described separatists as Anabaptists, Brownists, Independents, and Congregationalists, and linked them in a genealogy that encompassed the worst features of recent decades. Those who abandoned the visible church were guilty of ‘dispensing Ordinances by their *self-consecration*’, and of ‘proclaiming themselves *the gathered Churches*, contradistinct to the Nation, and all Christians in it’.¹²⁴⁸ Making matters worse, their acts of ‘Rebellion, Schism, and horrid Treason’ were ‘at this day most sadly (though

¹²⁴³ Zachary Crofton, *Reformation not Separation* (London, 1662), p. 4.

¹²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

¹²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 30 – 1 (separation and superstition), 33 (conservation).

¹²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 40; see also pp. 8, 10, 58, and 70.

¹²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7; see also pp. 12 – 13, 20, and 47.

falsely) reflected on the most loyal, sober, serious, reforming, non-conforming Presbyterians'.¹²⁴⁹ Heresiological and political arguments were nearly a century old, and Anglicans had used them so often against Presbyterians and other nonconformists that Crofton's argument was unlikely to persuade many people. He was right, however, about one matter. Fears about Presbyterian militancy were on the rise. In November 1661, rumors began to circulate about a Presbyterian plot against the government, although none ever materialized.¹²⁵⁰ The Solemn League and Covenant nonetheless remained a symbol of resistance, despite—and perhaps because of—public burnings of it. When the Oath of Uniformity went into effect on 19 May 1662, a firm and ultimately irreversible division was made between Anglicans and Dissenters. The Church of England emerged victorious and hegemonic.

IV.

The early 1660s saw the publication of two key works concerned with the English Reformation: Peter Heylyn's *Ecclesia Restaurata* and Anthony Sparrow's *A Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, with other Publick Records of the Church of England*. Sparrow's was the more popular; subsequent editions were published in 1671, 1675, 1684, and 1699, whereas *Ecclesia Restaurata* was reprinted only in 1670 and 1674. The two books shared a similar if not identical view of Tudor religious history although they took a very different approach to the same matter. *A Collection of Articles* was a document reader, and appears to have been the first of its kind. *Ecclesia Restaurata* was a work of antiquarian scholarship. Together the two works portrayed the Reformation as an event begun by Edward and settled by Elizabeth.

¹²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 13.

¹²⁵⁰ On the Presbyterian plot, see Greaves, *Deliver us from Evil*, pp. 70 – 2.

With *A Collection of Articles*, Sparrow sought to show what the Church of England had maintained ‘for the good of her members ever since the Reformation’.¹²⁵¹ The front cover carried a further prescriptive reason for publication: ‘to Vindicate the Church of ENGLAND and to promote Uniformity and peace in the same.’ Sparrow was especially concerned with the topic of authority, and he used the introduction of his work to briefly sketch the origins and nature of ecclesial authority within the Church of England. He began by drawing upon a traditional scholastic distinction between the power of Jurisdiction and that of Legislation. The former sought ‘to preserve peace and unity’ while the latter existed ‘to make Canons and Constitutions upon emergent occasions.’¹²⁵² As Sparrow explained it, Christ gave the power of Jurisdiction directly to the church and the power of Legislation to the apostles and their successors, the bishops.¹²⁵³ He not only argued that this twofold authority was necessary for the church as a community, but that ‘This Authority in determining doubts and controversies the Church hath practised in all Ages, and her constant practice is the best interpreter of her right.’¹²⁵⁴ Sparrow appealed to three kinds of councils as precedents for the Church of England’s authority to determine theological controversies: the apostolic council recorded in Acts 15, the four ‘general Councils’ (Nicaea in 325, Constantinople in 381, Ephesus in 431, and Chalcedon in 451), and also ‘National Councils’ held in the early church, such as the council of Orange (529).¹²⁵⁵ The confessional standards codified in the sixteenth century by the Church of England were ‘both her right and her duty to do, both for the preservation of her peace, and the guidance and conduct of the souls committed to her charge’.¹²⁵⁶ Like Heylyn, Sparrow was especially concerned to clarify

¹²⁵¹ Anthony Sparrow, *A Collection of Articles* (London, 1661), no pag.; if following on from sig. *, this would be sig. *3v.

¹²⁵² Ibid., sig. *r – v.

¹²⁵³ Ibid., sig. *2r – v.

¹²⁵⁴ Ibid., no pag.; if following on from sig. *, this would be sig. *3v.

¹²⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁵⁶ Ibid.

the role of Parliament in sixteenth-century ecclesiastical history. Against those such as Sander, Sparrow denied ‘the notorious slander which some of the Roman perswasion have endeavoured to cast upon her: That her Reformation hath been altogether Lay and Parliamentary’. To the contrary, he affirmed, ‘the Reformation of this Church was orderly and Synodical by the Guides and Governours of souls, and confirmed by Supreame Authority, and so in every particular as legal as any reformation could or ought to be.’¹²⁵⁷ Sparrow could neither have been more explicit in his repudiation of the failed reformations of the previous two decades, nor more laudatory in his endorsement of Tudor ecclesiastical change.

It is easy to miss the novelty of Sparrow’s approach. Historical document collections were not common in the mid-seventeenth century. By gathering together nearly two-dozen sixteenth-century sources in a single volume, *A Collection of Articles* let readers peruse firsthand the event that Sparrow, like a growing number of his contemporaries, termed ‘the Reformation’. Previous studies of ecclesiastical history had sometimes included transcriptions of key works in their pages; Fuller and Heylyn both included the complete text of Edward VI’s 1547 injunctions, and Heylyn incorporated a lengthy appendix at the end of *Ecclesia Restaurata* that contained both the Latin and English editions of the Articles of Religion.¹²⁵⁸ Sparrow included these as well but alongside a number of other texts, such as the 1548 English communion office,¹²⁵⁹ the visitation articles of Archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley,¹²⁶⁰ the Elizabethan injunctions,¹²⁶¹ the liturgy for the Royal Touch,¹²⁶² and the complete canon law of 1604.¹²⁶³ Sparrow’s work offered an expansive and detailed portrait of what had been reformed the previous century and

¹²⁵⁷ Ibid., no pag.; if following on from sig. *, this would be sig. *4r.

¹²⁵⁸ Fuller, *Church-History*, Book VII, pp. 372 – 4; Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restuarata* (London, 1674), pp. 34 – 6 (Injunctions), 349 – 68 (Articles).

¹²⁵⁹ Sparrow, *A Collection of Articles*, pp. 17 – 24.

¹²⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 25 – 31 (Archbishop Cranmer), pp. 33 – 35 (bishop Ridley).

¹²⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 61 – 80.

¹²⁶² Ibid., pp. 223 – 4.

¹²⁶³ Ibid., pp. 301 – 372.

gave readers the chance to study the development and codification of the Church of England's orthodoxy.

Ecclesia Restaurata was Heylyn's most sustained work of sixteenth-century historiography. He dedicated it to Charles II, describing it as 'an History of the Reformation of the Church of ENGLAND, with all the Various Fortunes and Successes of it, from the first Agitations in Religion under Henry the Eighth (which served for a Preamble thereunto) until the Legal Settling and Establishment of it by the great Queen Elizabeth, of Happy Memory.'¹²⁶⁴ But *Ecclesia Restaurata* could not have been more different from Heylyn's *apologia* of the 1650s. Wholly absent was his Foxean portrayal of reformation as a typological pattern; gone too was his emphasis upon the purported lead taken by the clergy. Although Heylyn again attacked Sander's work—dubbing him, at one point, 'Dr. Slanders'¹²⁶⁵—*Ecclesia Restaurata* contained no polemic against Parliament. Even the historical scope of the work was different. The dedication 'To the Reader' outlined the reign of Henry VIII in barely a page, and the book instead opened with an account of the birth of Edward VI. Heylyn followed this with accounts of queens Jane and Mary, and finally the first eight years of Elizabeth's reign. *Ecclesia Restaurata* fundamentally broke with his previous undertakings.

At least some of this was due to Heylyn's antiquarian researches. *Ecclesia Restaurata* was generously punctuated with references to the writings of John Hayward,¹²⁶⁶ John Stow,¹²⁶⁷ and the holdings of Robert Cotton,¹²⁶⁸ and it remained informed by the *Actes and Monuments* of John Foxe.¹²⁶⁹ Herbert of Cherbury, Thomas Fuller, Raphael Holinshead, and Johannes

¹²⁶⁴ Peter Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, sig. A2.

¹²⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 294.

¹²⁶⁶ Ibid., e.g., pp. 2, 7, 9, 43.

¹²⁶⁷ Ibid., e.g., pp. 8, 9, 47, 97, 242, 261.

¹²⁶⁸ Ibid., e.g., pp. 54, 177, 218.

¹²⁶⁹ Ibid., e.g., pp. 34, 91, 106, 221 337.

Sleidanus were cited less often.¹²⁷⁰ Heylyn was generally loath to criticize his sources; he corrected both Stow and Foxe, but only over dates.¹²⁷¹ He studied the correspondence of several continental religious leaders, and cited select letters by John Calvin¹²⁷² and Peter Martyr Vermigli,¹²⁷³ and Heylyn knew of correspondence between Melanchthon and Cranmer between 1549 and 1551¹²⁷⁴—correspondence that has since been lost.¹²⁷⁵ In true antiquarian fashion, he closed his opening ‘To the Reader’ by referencing Tacitus:

I am to let thee know, that in the whole Carriage of this Work I have assumed unto my Self the Freedom of a *Just Historian*, concealing nothing out of Fear, nor speaking any thing for Favour: delivering nothing for a Truth without good Authority; but so delivering the Truth, as to witness for me that I am neither biassed by Love or Hatred, nor overswayed by Partiality and corrupt Affections.¹²⁷⁶

By appealing to documentary evidence and contemporary scholarship, and by claiming that impartiality and accuracy were his goals, it is clear that by 1661, Heylyn had internalized both the prescriptive ideals and the academic aspirations of seventeenth-century antiquarianism.

This is not to say that *Ecclesia Restaurata* was devoid of polemic. Heylyn ended the work not in 1563, when he claimed that ‘Religion and the State’ were ‘fortified and secured’ under Elizabeth,¹²⁷⁷ but in 1566, ‘when the Puritan Faction had began to disturb her [the Church of England’s] Order’.¹²⁷⁸ Puritanism was therefore not part of the Reformation, but something that came after and opposed it. Puritanism was also something that came from elsewhere. It is

¹²⁷⁰ Ibid., e.g., pp. 5 (Herbert), 22 (Fuller), 97 (Holinshead), 214 (Sleidanus).

¹²⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 9 (Stow), 69 and 98 (Foxe).

¹²⁷² Ibid., pp. 80, 107.

¹²⁷³ Ibid., pp. 92, 94, 250, 328.

¹²⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 108.

¹²⁷⁵ John Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 154 – 6.

¹²⁷⁶ Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, if following on from sig. a2, this would be sig. a3v; Tacitus is also cited on p. 48.

¹²⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 332.

¹²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 346.

tempting to write that for Heylyn, Puritanism was wrong because it was foreign—as if he were xenophobic. But nothing in *Ecclesia Restaurata* tends in this direction; in some instances, something foreign could be desirable—as in his discussion of the retention of images and artwork in Lutheran churches. Rather, from the very beginning of *Ecclesia Restaurata*, Heylyn was concerned to trace the genealogy of Puritanism.¹²⁷⁹ Beginning with liturgical debates in the reign of Edward VI, Heylyn traced a line of anti-liturgical and anti-episcopal thought from Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin through the Marian exiles to the Elizabethan Puritans.¹²⁸⁰ John Calvin came off especially badly, as an embittered egotist who, having been ignored by Archbishop Cranmer, sought to ingratiate himself with the Edwardian council.¹²⁸¹ In Heylyn's words, Calvin, 'thinking nothing to be well done, which either was not done by him, or by his Direction...must needs be meddling in such matters as belonged not to him.'¹²⁸² Because of Calvin, there was 'a continual multiplying of Disorders in all Parts of this Church'.¹²⁸³ Heylyn's narrative was quite similar to Fuller's *Church-History*, and it should be noted that Heylyn did not dwell upon theological matters such as predestination.¹²⁸⁴ Perhaps this is because scholastic theology was not a primary point of contention in the early 1660s, unlike liturgy and episcopacy.

By writing a linear narrative, Heylyn changed some of his earlier claims. In *Ecclesia Restaurata*, Henry VIII's rejection of papal supremacy 'opened the first way to the *Reformation*, and gave encouragement to those who enclined unto it'.¹²⁸⁵ This was very different than the typological argument that he relied upon in the 1650s, and this change also shifted the center of gravity towards Edward VI and Elizabeth I; in 1661, Heylyn no longer viewed Henry VIII as an

¹²⁷⁹ Ibid., sig. ar – v.

¹²⁸⁰ Ibid., e.g., pp. 78 – 80.

¹²⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 65, 79 – 80.

¹²⁸² Ibid., p. 80.

¹²⁸³ Ibid., p. 93.

¹²⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 73 – 4 mentions 'predestinarians' but in passing.

¹²⁸⁵ Ibid., if following on from sig. A2, this would be sig. A3v; the same point is repeated on p. 122.

equal player in the English Reformation. A similar change can be seen in the theological influences that Heylyn detected at the Edwardian court. Unlike his contemporaries, he recognized that these influences changed over the six years of Edward's reign. Somerset 'had declared himself a Friend to the *Lutheran* Party in the time of King *Henry*',¹²⁸⁶ and this caused him to be 'More Moderate in carrying on the Work of *Reformation*, then those who after had the Managing and Conduct of it'.¹²⁸⁷ Within this initial context of moderate reformation, pious English bishops such as Nicholas Ridley conducted their own study of early Christian history, theology, and devotional practice, and consequently arrived at conclusions neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian. The former held 'the Figment of Consubstantiation' while the latter was content 'to fly to Signs and Figures, as if there had been nothing else in the blessed *Eucharist*.' Ridley, however, 'thought it most agreeable to the Rules of Piety, to frame his Judgement to the Dictates of the Ancient Fathers', and thus advocated 'a *Real presence* of *Christ's* Body and Blood in the Holy Sacrament as to exclude that Corporal Eating of the same'. Ridley soon compelled Cranmer to adopt the same view.¹²⁸⁸ The 1549 Book of Common Prayer then followed and contained the same patristic doctrine.

Earlier antiquarian writings on Tudor ecclesiastical history had generally homogenized the disparate religious developments of the mid-sixteenth century, especially those that pertained to the Book of Common Prayer. For example, and as already noted, when John Hayward detailed the Prayer Book rebellion of 1549, he drew upon the king's response to the rebels and described the Prayer Book as little other than a translation of the mass into English.¹²⁸⁹ Like Hayward and ultimately Cranmer before them, Heylyn described the first English liturgy as a translation of the

¹²⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 33.

¹²⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 118.

¹²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 53.

¹²⁸⁹ John Hayward, *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth*, edited by Barrett L. Beer (The Kent State University Press, 1993), p. 79.

mass, but whereas Hayward let the king's epistle to the Devon rebels stand for the whole subsequent history of Prayer Book revision, Heylyn argued that things instead spiraled out of control. Turning to the latter half of Edward VI's reign, Heylyn detected a confluence of events that ultimately destabilized the regime. In 1549, 'there was nothing to be found but Troubles and Commotions, and Disquiets, both in Church and State.'¹²⁹⁰ And then, things got worse. John Calvin became increasingly involved in the affairs at court; because of his meddling, debates about the new English liturgy soon arose,¹²⁹¹ and from here matters of fundamental orthodoxy were increasingly debated. Perhaps influenced by Richard Hooker's argument against Polish models of reformation, Heylyn alleged that the Polish reformer John a Lasco advocated Arianism by denying the divinity of Christ.¹²⁹² These disorders were exacerbated by further spoliation of the church by 'The *Pirates* of the Court',¹²⁹³ all of whom were directed by Northumberland.¹²⁹⁴ At no point did Heylyn portray Northumberland as having been driven by any kind of ideological considerations or theological ideals. Rather, 'He had long Reigned without a Crown' and simply sought his own self-aggrandizement.¹²⁹⁵ In Heylyn's hands, the story of Edward VI's reign concluded not with the boy king's death, but with Northumberland's failed attempt at diverting the crown from Mary to Jane Grey. Here was no peaceful or easy story, but one of failed ambition. In 1661, Heylyn's narration of the mid-sixteenth century decisively broke with its apologetic origins in the 1650s.

Heylyn's discussion of early Elizabethan history framed it as a counterpoint that restored to unity the fragmentation and dissolution that defined the last years of Edward's reign. This was

¹²⁹⁰ Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, p. 73.

¹²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 78 – 80.

¹²⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 89, 92.

¹²⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

¹²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

¹²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

most clearly exemplified by his discussion of Elizabethan-era Eucharistic doctrine and practice. Heylyn offered no detailed discussion of the 1552 Book of Common Prayer in his discussion of Edwardian England but gave it more sustained consideration by way of his discussion of the 1559 Book of Common Prayer. In *Ecclesia Restaurata*—for the first time, it would seem—an English historian took seriously the changes in Eucharistic language between 1549 and 1559. In his discussion of the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer, Heylyn noted that the 1549 liturgy identified the consecrated bread and wine as the Body and Blood of Christ, while the 1552 liturgy did not. He did not think that any change in doctrine had occurred between these two liturgies, but he did claim that the 1552 revision was intended to pacify ‘Calvin and his Disciples’.¹²⁹⁶ In the 1559 revision, ‘the Revisors of the Book joyned both Forms together, lest under colour of rejecting a *Carnal*, they might be thought also to deny such a *Real Presence* as was defended in the Writings of the Antient Fathers.’¹²⁹⁷ Heylyn’s language tied the 1559 liturgy to his explication of the theological origins of the Book of Common Prayer, which he believed came from a renewed appreciation for the early church. From the standpoint of contemporary scholarship, Heylyn’s observations concerning the Eucharistic language of the 1559 liturgy are obvious even if his explanation is debatable. From the standpoint of seventeenth-century scholarship, his recognition of liturgical heterogeneity between 1549 and 1559 was a real divergence from the homogenizing tendencies of his contemporaries.

Taken together, *Ecclesia Restaurata* and *A Collection of Articles* portrayed a remarkably similar vision. Sparrow divided his volume into three sections, each of which corresponded to the reign of a particular monarch: Edward VI, Elizabeth, and James VI and I. As in *Ecclesia Restaurata*, Henry VIII was given no place of importance; the king’s 1536 abrogation of select

¹²⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 283.

¹²⁹⁷ Ibid.

holy days was the sole Henrician text that appeared in Sparrow's reader—and this only because Elizabeth reissued it in 1560. Furthermore, just as Heylyn envisioned Elizabeth settling the Reformation, the Virgin Queen was the key figure for Sparrow as well. Sixteen of the twenty-three documents in his volume came from her reign. However, there were also differences between the two authors. Heylyn concluded *Ecclesia Restaurata* with the rise of Puritanism, but Sparrow included both Elizabeth's 1573 'Proclamation against the despisers or breakers of the orders prescribed in the book of Common Prayer'¹²⁹⁸ and the Jacobean canon law. Because each of these documents roundly condemned those English Christians who refused the Anglican church, *A Collection of Articles* tended in the same direction as *Ecclesia Restaurata* by drawing a firm line of division between the Church of England and its opponents. The inclusion of the Jacobean canon law is a good reminder that for many people, there was no reason to periodize the Reformation as an exclusively Tudor event. It is less clear what to make of Sparrow's excision of Jane Grey and Mary Tudor from his reader. Heylyn glowingly praised the former as a defender of the Reformation and sought to offer a dispassionate view of the latter, but Sparrow merely passed over them in silence. The historiographies of Heylyn and Sparrow did not wholly map one another, but they aligned in key ways. More importantly, they did not conflict. By perusing the researches of Heylyn and Sparrow together, readers could use each text to vindicate and further detail the claims made in the other. With Heylyn and Sparrow, a historiographical tradition began to form in the early 1660s that located the history of the Reformation along an Edwardian-Elizabethan axis.

The excision of Henry VIII from the history of the English Reformation did not become normative. In 1672, another edition of Herbert of Cherbury's *The Life and Reign of King Henry the Eighth* was published; in 1676, Francis Bacon's history of Henry VII was republished in a

¹²⁹⁸ Sparrow, *A Collection of Articles*, pp. 227 – 8.

new edition that also contained Francis Godwin's *Annals of England*. In 1679, when Gilbert Burnet published the first part of *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, he placed this older interest in Henry VIII at the forefront of Reformation historiography. The first half of Burnet's *Reformation* focused entirely upon Henry's reign; the second half of the work, which was published two years later, focused upon the reigns of Edward, Mary and Elizabeth. Burnet's evident interest in Henry VIII could be seen as redefining the Reformation as a principally Henrician event, but as Burnet wrote in his Epistle Dedicatory to Charles II, the Reformation 'was carryed on by a slow and unsteady Progress under King *Henry the VIII*'.¹²⁹⁹ This ambivalent statement sharply juxtaposes with the amount of space devoted to Henry's reign, but Burnet appears to have been doing more than just following the print history of the early-mid 1570s. Writing about Henrician England allowed Burnet to argue against many of the claims made a century earlier by Nicholas Sander. This was one of the major goals of the work. Beginning with his Preface, Burnet attacked Sander, and he included a thirty-two page appendix on 'Errors & Falshoods in Sander's Book of the English Schism' at the end of his volume.¹³⁰⁰ In it, Burnet touched upon the ancestry of Elizabeth and explained, 'the chief design of whose [Sander's] writing, was to defame *Elizabeth*, and to blast her Title to the Crown.'¹³⁰¹ Focusing on Henry was important because it enabled Burnet to better secure the reputation of Elizabeth.

The title of Burnet's volumes is telling. Knox's work was entitled *The History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*; Burnet entitled his work *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. Born in Edinburgh, Burnet knew intimately the divisiveness of Scottish religious debate. His maternal uncle was Archibald Johnston, Lord Wariston, but

¹²⁹⁹ Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Part I (London, 1679), no pag.

¹³⁰⁰ Ibid., Part I, sig. (b); Book II, pp. 41 – 4, 86, 113 – 14, 149, 153, 356; in *Reformation* (1679) the Appendix follows the Collection of Records, while in *Reformation* (1681), it follows the Collection of Records at the end of Part I.

¹³⁰¹ Ibid., Part I, Book III, p. 363.

Burnet's father had been forced into exile during the civil wars for his refusal to support the Solemn League and Covenant.¹³⁰² Burnet's *Reformation* was, however, quite opposite any imitation of Knox, whom Burnet described only in negative terms as 'a man of hot temper' who preached 'more severely' than his colleagues.¹³⁰³ Furthermore, when Burnet referenced Scottish writing on the Reformation, he relied upon the *History of the Church of Scotland* by John Spottiswood, Archbishop of St. Andrews. With a title patterned after Knox's infamous work, in Burnet's volumes Presbyterian writings and sympathies were otherwise present only by way of their conspicuous absence.

Burnet's *Reformation* closely followed the historiographical trajectory set by Peter Heylyn. Both wrote against Sander. Burnet, like Heylyn, was also concerned to emphasize that the Church of England's religion was not the mere determination of Parliament.¹³⁰⁴ When Burnet turned to Elizabethan history, he like Heylyn focused primarily upon the early years of the reign, following the story through 1571, when the first set of Elizabethan canons were written. Although this was slightly greater in scope than the discussion found in *Ecclesia Restuarata*, the goal was the same: to fully distinguish between the history of the Reformation and those Elizabethan debates about religion that so deeply influenced the civil wars of the seventeenth century. Finally, and also like Heylyn, Burnet dedicated his work to Charles II with a prefatory letter, the contents of which recalled Heylyn's work from the 1650s. Burnet opened the Epistle Dedicatory by writing, 'The first step that was made in the *Reformation* of this Church, was the restoring to Your Royal Ancestors the Rights of the Crown, and an entire Dominion over all their

¹³⁰² For a general overview of Burnet's background, see Martin Greig, 'Burnet, Gilbert (1643–1715)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2013 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/4061>, accessed 17 Jan 2016].

¹³⁰³ Burnet, *Reformation* (1681), Part II, Book II, p. 339; Part II, Book I, p. 227.

¹³⁰⁴ Ibid., Part II, The Preface, no pag.

Subjects, of which they had been disseised by the craft and violence of an unjust Pretender'.¹³⁰⁵

As noted in the last chapter, Heylyn had also described the royal supremacy as the first step in the Reformation. In some ways, Burnet's historical vision of the past witnessed to starker contrasts than Heylyn's. As Burnet told the king on the next page of the same dedication, 'The design of the *Reformation*, was to restore Christianity to what it was at first, and to purge it of those Corruptions, with which it was over-run in the later and darker Ages.'¹³⁰⁶ But in many ways, Burnet's dedicatory epistle sounded political themes that were, by 1679, many decades old. The Reformation 'was brought to a full settlement' under Elizabeth and 'was defended by the Learned Pen of King *James*'. Most importantly, given the political turmoil still so fresh in the minds of so many, 'the established frame of it, under which it had so long flourished, was overthrown with your Majesty's blessed Father, who fell with it, and honoured it by his unexempl'd Suffering for it; and was again restored to its former beauty and order by Your Majesties happy Return.'¹³⁰⁷ The politics of the Restoration were very much Burnet's own, and although his study of Tudor ecclesiastical history challenged some of the arguments made by earlier writers, Burnet's *Reformation* cannot be read as anything other than a bulwark for the political and ecclesiastical consensus of his time. For Burnet as for Heylyn, the descriptive was far from politically indifferent.

Despite his many similarities with Heylyn, Burnet sometimes wrote unfavorably of Heylyn's work. In the Preface, after passing over Fuller's ecclesiastical history with the quip that 'his work gives no great Satisfaction', Burnet indicated mixed admiration for Heylyn's researches.

¹³⁰⁵ Burnet, *Reformation*, Part I, no pag.

¹³⁰⁶ Ibid., no pag.

¹³⁰⁷ Ibid., no pag.

*Doctor Heylin wrote smoothly and handsomely, his Method and Stile are good, and his work was generally more read than any thing that had appeared before him: but either he was very ill informed, or very much led by his Passions; and he being wrought on by most violent prejudices against some that were concerned in that time, delivers many things in such a manner and so strangely, that one would think that he had been secretly set on to it by those of the Church of Rome, though I doubt not he was a sincere Protestant, but violently carried away by some particular conceits.*¹³⁰⁸

Two things are worthy of note here. First, Burnet's reference to 'Passions' was diametrically opposite Heylyn's own Tacitean appeal at the beginning of *Ecclesia Restaurata*. By arguing that Heylyn had fundamentally failed in his adherence to antiquarian academic aspirations, Burnet sought to align Heylyn's work more closely with theological polemic than with the dispassionate historical study that defined Heylyn's stated intent, and which he aspired to with *Ecclesia Restaurata*. The forcefulness of such an allegation should not be underestimated.

Second, it is regrettable that Burnet did not specify which of Heylyn's writings, or which passages therein, were so problematic. For example, Burnet complained that Heylyn had erroneously followed Sander in claiming that Anne Boleyn's father judged her guilty of adultery.¹³⁰⁹ Perhaps Sander's influence was the major problem here, as writing against Sander was one of Burnet's major aims. In another instance, he attacked Heylyn without naming him. In *Ecclesia Restaurata*, Heylyn recounted the story of the Spirit in the Wall, a forged miracle in the reign of Mary that he attributed to the Zwinglians, alleging that they sought 'to draw aside the People from their due Allegiance.'¹³¹⁰ Although Burnet ascribed Heylyn's explanation to the

¹³⁰⁸ Ibid., Preface, sig. (b)v.

¹³⁰⁹ Burnet, *Reformation* (1681), Part I, Book III, pp. 363 – 4.

¹³¹⁰ Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, p. 207.

latter's 'Malignity', he also attacked Heylyn's explanation for its lack of evidence.¹³¹¹ This too seems a small point of argument, and unworthy of Burnet's impassioned denunciation. Two explanatory options present themselves: Heylyn's lack of evidence, or his apparent willingness to condone loyalty to the Marian regime. If the former, then Burnet's argument with Heylyn was merely academic; if the latter, then this may indicate why Burnet later turned against James II. Burnet had a generally negative valuation of Catholicism, despite praising a small number of Catholics (e.g., More and Pole) for particular virtues. Burnet focused far more than Heylyn did upon those who were burned at the stake under Mary, although Burnet did not at any point condone resistance against her. Here again it is difficult to say why Burnet attacked Heylyn, when so much of their historiography was so very similar.

The most important contribution that Burnet made with his *History* was his use and publication of documentary evidence. Each volume of his work contained transcriptions of a large number of sixteenth-century documents. These included confessional documents such as the Articles of Religion, but also included a number of previously unpublished texts. One needed knowledge of Latin and French to read all of the documents, which indicates that Burnet wrote his work for an educated audience. Almost all of the source material for Part I, Book II, concerned Henry VIII's divorce, although a small number of other documents, such as bishop Tunstal's allowance that Thomas More read the heretical books of Wyclif and Luther,¹³¹² were also included. If one did not have Latin one could still read the material in Part I, Book III, which looked at theological developments and debates under Henry VIII, such as episcopal debates in

¹³¹¹ Burnet, *Reformation* (1681), Part II, Book II, pp. 273 – 4.

¹³¹² Burnet, *Reformation* (1681), Part I, A Collection of Records, pp. 8 – 9. The complete edition of the *Reformation* is not paginated consecutively; the Collection of Records for the first part comes after Part I, while the Collection of Records for the second part comes after Part II.

the mid-late 1530s about the nature and number of the sacraments.¹³¹³ Other documents were not necessarily of interest for the history of religion, but were relevant for understanding the time period; Burnet published for the first time the journal of Edward VI,¹³¹⁴ and a series of documents about the relationship of Scotland to England.¹³¹⁵ Like Heylyn and Fuller, Burnet also published a detailed comparison between the 1552 Edwardian Articles of Religion and the 1562 Articles of Elizabeth.¹³¹⁶ Wholly unlike his predecessors, Burnet included numerous documents from Mary's reign, such as Bishop Tunstal's articles of visitation,¹³¹⁷ the Marian liturgy for the consecration of cramp-rings,¹³¹⁸ and the writ for burning Archbishop Cranmer.¹³¹⁹ The same sort of detail was found in the collection of documents for Elizabeth, which included the liturgy for Matthew Parker's consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury,¹³²⁰ Parker's Eleven Articles,¹³²¹ and Pius V's excommunication of Elizabeth.¹³²² In detail and scope, Burnet's source reader was far more expansive than Sparrow's. Burnet included almost none of the texts found Sparrow's collection, but this does not appear to have been polemical. Referring to the Edwardian injunctions, Burnet wrote that they were 'so often printed, I shall refer the Reader that would consider them more carefully, to the Collection of these and other such curious things by the Right Reverend Father in God *Anthony Sparrow* now Lord Bishop of *Norwich*.'¹³²³ As with so much else in his *History*, Burnet did not stake out new ground.

¹³¹³ Ibid., pp. 201 – 20.

¹³¹⁴ Ibid., A Collection of Records... Referred to in the Second Part, pp. 3 – 67.

¹³¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 106 – 11.

¹³¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 209 – 220.

¹³¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 260 – 5.

¹³¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 295 – 7.

¹³¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 300 – 1.

¹³²⁰ Ibid., pp. 363 – 5.

¹³²¹ Ibid., pp. 365 – 8; here the pagination is inconsistent—these should be pp. 369 – 72.

¹³²² Ibid., pp. 377 – 9.

¹³²³ Ibid., Part II, Book I, p. 29.

In one very important instance, Burnet used a primary document in a wholly polemical manner. At the end of his second volume, he included a transcription of a letter written by Francis Walsingham to the Secretary of France around 1590. Labelling it as '*Walsingham's* Letter concerning the Queens proceedings against both Papists and Puritans', this letter is the source for the much later apocryphal claim, noted in chapter three, that Elizabeth did not wish to make windows into men's souls. Walsingham explained that Elizabeth's religious policy was 'grounded upon two Principles.' The first was that 'Consciences are not to be forced, but to be won and reduced by force of Truth, with the aid of Time, and use of all good means of Instruction and Perswasion.' The second principle was that 'Causes of Consciences when they exceed their bounds, and grow to be matter of Faction, loose their Nature, and that Sovereign Princes ought distinctly to punish their Practices and Contempt, though coloured with the pretence of Conscience and Religion.'¹³²⁴ Walsingham further explained that upon acceding to the throne, Elizabeth believed that she would be able to persuade Catholics to accept her headship in the Church. However, she sought to approach the matter differently than her father, for whom

the refusal to take the same Oath, without further circumstances was made Treason. But contrariwise, her Majesty not liking to make Windows into mens Hearts and secret Thoughts, except the abundance of them did overflow into overt and express Acts, or Affirmations, tempered her Law so, as it restraineth every manifest disobedience, in impugning and impeaching, advisedly and maliciously, her Majesties supreme Power, maintaining and extolling a Foreign jurisdiction:¹³²⁵

¹³²⁴ Ibid., Part II, Book III, p. 418.

¹³²⁵ Ibid., Part II, Book III, p. 419.

The 'window' in question concerned religion only insofar as it was a matter of political peace; those who refused the queen's authority and aligned themselves with the papacy through revolt were outside of the queen's graces. Otherwise, she hoped that in time she would persuade Catholics to accept the Church of England. The same approach was, according to Walsingham, taken with Puritans. Some of their claims were tolerable, but once they broached the possibility of sedition, 'the State were compelled to hold somewhat a harder hand to restrain them than before, yet was it with as great moderation, as the Peace of the State or Church could permit.'¹³²⁶ And thus Burnet's *History* ended, with the Church of England and its monarch victorious against two enemies, the Catholic and the Puritan. It was a message that resounded as clearly in 1681 as it had a century prior.

V.

When Charles II died in 1685, was the Church of England Protestant? 'Protestant' increasingly became a term of self-description only in the 1680s. This is well illustrated by the print history of *The Protestant Almanack*. Begun by the royalist poet William Winstanley, *The Protestant Almanack* had a difficult start; it was first published in 1668 and republished in 1669, but it did not appear again until 1677. No edition was published in 1678 or 1679, but Winstanley published his almanac annually between 1680 and 1685, again in 1689, and from 1691 published it each year until his death in 1698. *The Protestant Almanack* was published again in 1699 and for the last time in 1700. The sporadic nature of *The Protestant Almanack* can be attributed neither to the unpopularity of almanacs nor to Winstanley; he had another almanac, *Poor Robin*, which was first published in 1662 and was printed annually through the remainder of Winstanley's life and well into the eighteenth century. Through 1684, the front cover of *The*

¹³²⁶ Ibid., Part II, Book III, p. 421.

Protestant Almanack noted the years that had elapsed since two key dates: ‘The Incarnation of Jesus Christ’ and ‘Our Deliverance from *Popery* by Queen *Eliz.*’ Between these two events, the edition for 1685 added a third: ‘The Reformation begun by *Luther.*’¹³²⁷ Later editions maintained these three dates but progressively included other dates as well. The 1689 edition added the creation of the world, the Gun-Powder treason, and the fire of London, and also rewrote its reference to Luther as ‘*Martin Luther* wrote against the Pope’. For that same year, Winstanley included his first reference to the evangelization of England, which he dated to the year 190; this was likely a reference to king Lucius, who is now believed to have been a legend, but whose story was contained in the Venerable Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*. When the next edition appeared two years later, Winstanley had included ‘Our Second Deliverance from Popery, by K. *Will & Q. Mary*’, and in 1694 added ‘Our first Deliverance from Popery by K. *Edward VI*’, renumbering the deliverances by Elizabeth and William and Mary accordingly. By the mid-1690s, when it was published most consistently, the front cover of *The Protestant Almanack* recounted a series of deliverances that followed Martin Luther’s anti-papal protest of 1516 (according to Winstanley’s dating).

Other factors made the developing narrative on Winstanley’s almanac increasingly appealing. The Popish Plot, a conspiracy that began in 1678 and alleged that Catholics were plotting against both king and kingdom, helped entrench a growing sense of shared Protestant unity among some English. Titus Oates, the principal fabricator of the Popish Plot, claimed that in 1677, he had learned that Catholics were plotting to poison the king, with the hope that James, the king’s brother, would inherit the throne and reinstate Catholicism.¹³²⁸ Once this was done,

¹³²⁷ William Winstanley, *The Protestant Almanack* (London, 1684).

¹³²⁸ Titus Oates, *The Discovery of the Popish Plot* (London, 1679), p. 2, n. 5.

Catholics would ‘Rise and Cut the Throats of 100000. Protestants in *London*’.¹³²⁹ Oates gave his initial testimony before several people, including Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, a justice of the peace, who was found murdered several months later on 17 October 1678. Despite the king’s own continuing skepticism about the plot,¹³³⁰ Godfrey’s death rapidly gave Oates’ rumormongering the appearance of truth. One solution to the imagined uprising was for the Church of England to join forces with Dissenters, as Catholics identified both groups as equally Protestant. Such was the message of the prescriptively entitled broadside *Protestant Unity*, which identified its contents as ‘The best Policy to defeat *Popery*, and all its Bloody Practices’. The first three lines of the broadside said it all: ‘Would *England* ever blest and happy be, / It must be done by perfect Unity, / Let *Protestants* in all things then agree.’¹³³¹ Against a shared enemy, it was an attractive message.

Not all were convinced. In his pamphlet *The Reformed Catholique: Or, the True Protestant*, Roger L’Estrange, censor of the press, cautioned against any plans for Protestant union in England. ‘Does not our *Saviour* himself tell us that *there shall arise False Christs and False Prophets?* and why not **False Protestants?**’¹³³² The ‘False Protestants’ in question were those whom L’Estrange and others termed ‘Protestant Dissenters’. Drawing upon the memory of the civil wars, L’Estrange sought to remind his readers that ‘The *Protestant Dissenters* pretended the same respect for the *King* and *Church*, with the *Royal Party*’, but when they thought that popular support would back them, they ‘took up *Arms against the Government*, which they Swore to *Defend*.’¹³³³ Protestant Dissenters could not be trusted; their religion was as false as their politics. Many shared L’Estrange’s sense of confessional demarcation, but used other

¹³²⁹ Ibid., p. 24, n. 53.

¹³³⁰ John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (St. Martin’s Press, 1972; repr. Phoenix Press, 2000), e.g., pp. 85 – 7, 158.

¹³³¹ Anonymous, *Protestant Unity* (London, n.d.).

¹³³² L’Estrange, *The Reformed Catholique*, p. 6.

¹³³³ Ibid., p. 32.

names for the same groups. On the cover page of his deeply learned 1677 treatise *Origo Protestantium*, the clergyman John Shaw announced his defense of ‘the Protestant Catholick Religion...wherein *PROTESTANCY* is demonstrated to be elder than *POPERY*’.¹³³⁴ Beginning with the Council of Constance and continuing on through the Council of Basel and the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, Shaw traced the emergence of ‘the new *Popish Church*’ at the Fifth Lateran Council.¹³³⁵ Much like Erasmus, Luther, and the authors of the *Consilium*, Shaw saw early-sixteenth century history—before Luther—as the crux of this historical narrative. ‘Wherefore as the *Papists* frequently, but foolishly propose to us, *Where was your church before Luther?* So we upon the foregoing grounds may more reasonably demand of them, where was your *Popish Church* before *Julius* the Second, and *Leo* the Tenth?’¹³³⁶ Shaw also referred to Protestant Catholics as ‘*English Protestants*’, and he distinguished between these and ‘*Puritans*’, the latter of whom were defined by ‘their Principles of *Rebellion* and *Sedition* against the *King*, and their *Schism* against *Bishops*’.¹³³⁷ Reformed Catholics were True Protestants; they were English Protestants and Protestant Catholics. The opposed and were opposed not only by Papists, but by those collectively termed False Protestants, Protestant Dissenters, and Puritans.

Such terminological diversity could be problematic. Some used the term ‘True Protestants’ to designate those whom Shaw designated as Puritans and L’Estrange as Protestant Dissenters. A 1683 broadside entitled *A True-Protestant-Catechism* defined its subject as ‘Him that Protesteth against the Abominations of *Popery* and *Tyranny*.’ When asked to explain ‘Popery’, the True Protestant spoke of ‘Conformity to the *Hierarchical* Government and Discipline of the *Church* established by Law’; when asked to define ‘Tyranny’, the True

¹³³⁴ John Shaw, *Origo Protestantium* (London, 1677).

¹³³⁵ Ibid., p. 5.

¹³³⁶ Ibid., p. 8; see also p. 82.

¹³³⁷ Ibid., pp. 53 – 4.

Protestant answered, ‘’Tis the exercise of *Monarchical Government*, according to the Rights inherent in the Crown, and confirmed by Law’.¹³³⁸ According to the broadside’s author, True Protestants engaged in ‘*bloody Villanies*’ against a number of people, including ‘the Sacred Person of the King’ and ‘*Orthodox-Protestants (viz. Church-of-England-men)*’.¹³³⁹ In 1684, writing against the works of the recently executed regicide theorist Algernon Sidney, William Assheton, an Anglican clergyman and an active polemicist, ascribed all ‘Anti-Monarchical Tenets’ to ‘the *True-Protestant PARTY*’.¹³⁴⁰ In a mischievous subversion of seemingly set confessional demarcations, Assheton included Catholics, especially Jesuits who justified theories of resistance and regicide, among the True Protestants.

For others, true Protestantism eschewed violence even as it protested against all of the Catholic features in the Church of England. In a pamphlet written primarily against his opponents in New England, George Fox, the found of Quakerism, also hit out against the Church of England, asking, ‘you *Protestants*, so called, in other places; how do you call and observe CHRISTMASS Day, CANDLEMASS Day, MICHAELMASS Day, LENT Time, EASTER and WHITSON-Tide, and other the Saints Dayes?’¹³⁴¹ Fox agreed with his New England opponents that ‘True Protestants’ were ‘*such as protest against the Pope and the Antichristian Wayes the Papists have set up*’,¹³⁴² but unlike the Church of England, Fox understood protest and rejection to be synonymous. Still others appealed to True Protestant convictions to justify violence. Shortly after James II came to the throne in 1685, a failed attempt at overthrowing him led to the execution of the conspirators. One of these was Colonel Richard Rumbold, who had served under Oliver Cromwell. From the scaffold, he declared that he had fought for ‘*Just Rights and*

¹³³⁸ Anonymous, *A True-Protestant-Catechism* (London, 1683), r.

¹³³⁹ Ibid., v.

¹³⁴⁰ William Assheton, *The Royal Pardon* (London, 1684); see especially the comparative chart on p. 60.

¹³⁴¹ George Fox, *Caesar’s Due* (London, 1679), pp. 31 – 2.

¹³⁴² Ibid., p. 29.

Liberties, against Popery and Slavery'. He also declared that he 'adhered to the True Protestant Religion, detesting the erroneous Opinions of many that called themselves so'.¹³⁴³ Depending on one's definition of the term, the greatest enemies of True Protestants were True Protestants.

The most influential supporter of Protestant unity proved to be Gilbert Burnet, who increasingly used 'Protestant' to describe the Church of England during the 1680s. Peter Heylyn had freely described the Church of England as Protestant in *Ecclesia Restaurata*, but Burnet never did so in *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. The closest he came was his description of Heylyn as 'a sincere Protestant'. With the sole exception of his discussion of the civil wars of religion in France, which he described as being fought between Papists and Protestants, every other use of 'Protestant' in the *History* referred to the German Lutherans. In a sermon delivered on 30 January 1680/1, this began to change. Burnet told his audience, the Aldermen of the City of London, that 'It is a false Maxim to think that we are then the truest Protestants, when we have departed the furthest from every opinion or practice of the Church of Rome'.¹³⁴⁴ Burnet knew that all English Protestants would not be able to unite against a shared Catholic enemy, and as he made clear in a sermon in 1681, the major opponents to Protestant unity in England were the congregations in New England and the Presbyterians in Scotland. 'The one impose under pains of Banishment and Death...not only the Religion of their State, but many speculative points of Opinion, and other things that are certainly indifferent.' The Presbyterians were no better. Having 'imposed the Covenant under the pains of Excommunication', they were sometimes 'not far from an Inquisition'.¹³⁴⁵ Burnet's vision of Protestant unity could only be seen within the framework of the Church of England. In *The Protestant's Companion* (1685), which compared Anglican with Roman Catholic doctrine, he

¹³⁴³ Anonymous, *The Dying Speeches of Several Excellent Persons* (London, 1689), p. 24

¹³⁴⁴ Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached before the Aldermen of the City of London* (London, 1680), p. 24.

¹³⁴⁵ Idem., *An Exhortation to Peace and Union* (London, 1681), pp. 29 – 30.

denoted the national church on the front cover as ‘the Protestant Church of *England*’. The last section of the text was arguably the most important and contained a two-column chart entitled ‘*Protestant’s Loyalty and Popish Rebellion*’. The first column contained quotations from Charles I’s *Eikon Basilike*; the second column contained complaints by James I and Charles I against Catholic political allegiance.¹³⁴⁶ Allegations of superstition remained a key facet of Burnet’s polemic, but in the wake of the Popish Plot, he was among those who continued to believe that the real threat posed by Catholicism was political. By the mid-1680s, England had too many different kinds of Protestants with too many different kinds of political commitments. There was no singular ‘Protestantism’ within England, much less between England and the country immediately north of its border.

¹³⁴⁶ Idem., *The Protestant’s Companion* (London, 1685), pp. 42 – 3.

Epilogue

‘For it is a foolish thing to imagine that a quarrel between two *Monks* at *Wittemberg* should make such an alteration in the state of *Christendom*.’

- Edward Stillingfleet, *Several Conferences Between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England*, p. 116¹³⁴⁷

In British history, 1688 is important because of the Williamite invasion, also known as the Glorious Revolution. For the present history, 1688 is important for another reason: it saw the publication of the first volume of Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff’s *Commentarius Historicus et Apologeticus de Luthernismo sive De Reformatione Religionis Ductu D. Martini Lutheri* (*The Historical and Apologetic Commentary on Lutheranism, or On the Reformation of Religion Led by Dr. Martin Luther*). Seckendorff’s study, which he completed in 1692, is widely taken today as a point of historiographical demarcation. According to C. Scott Dixon, Seckendorff accepted the Luther centenary’s description of Luther’s work as reformation. Building off if it, he ‘legitimated this association by treating the Reformation as a distinct phenomenon with a beginning, an end (Luther’s death in 1546), and a fixed place in European history.’¹³⁴⁸ John W. O’Malley has similarly written that Seckendorff ‘made the crucial identification of Protestantism with Reformation, which in its modern sense had already been slipping gradually and unobtrusively into Lutheran historiographical vocabulary.’¹³⁴⁹ Both authors agree that Seckendorff’s historiography rapidly became normative among German Lutherans. Thus the historiography of the Reformation began where the history of the Reformation began: in the lands of Luther, among the followers of the German Hercules.

¹³⁴⁷ Edward Stillingfleet, *Several Conferences Between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England* (London, 1679).

¹³⁴⁸ C. Scott Dixon, *Contesting the Reformation* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), p. 9.

¹³⁴⁹ John W. O’Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 19.

But there is no reason to privilege Seckendorff this way. In his prologue, Seckendorff referenced the *Acta Eruditorum* (roughly ‘Philosophical Transactions’), a German journal dedicated to scholarly publication.¹³⁵⁰ Its August 1684 issue contained a review of Jean-Baptiste de Rosemond’s 1683 translation of Burnet’s *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*.¹³⁵¹ Seckendorff said little about it—‘I remember now that I read on page 383 of the 1684 *Leipzig Philosophical Transactions* about the *Historia Anglica* by Dr. Burnet’¹³⁵²—but this passing reference reveals not only that Seckendorff was following rather than initiating a trend, but that the trend in question partially developed because of earlier English writings about the Reformation—a label that referred not to the English experience of an international event, but to the English experience of a series of events in the British Isles. By 1660, a growing number of English authors had begun to demarcate *the* Reformation as ‘a distinct phenomenon’. By the early 1680s, Burnet’s two-volume study was simply the most detailed account yet written. Rosemond was not the only person to translate the *History* in the 1680s; when Melchior Mittelholzer translated it into Latin in 1686, Burnet’s great work was made available to an international audience.¹³⁵³ The influence of the *History* upon other European histories of the sixteenth century has not been traced, but it—like the influence of other seventeenth-century English historical writing—deserves to be.¹³⁵⁴ Somehow or another, practically every church

¹³⁵⁰ For a general overview, see Augustinus Hubertus Laeven, *The "Acta eruditorum" under the Editorship of Otto Mencke (1644-1707): The history of an International Learned Journal between 1682 and 1707*, trans. Lynne Richards (APA-Holland University Press, 1990).

¹³⁵¹ Jean-Baptiste de Rosemond (trans.), *Histoire de la Reformation de l'Eglise d'Angleterre* (London, 1683).

¹³⁵² Veit Ludwig Seckendorff, *Commentarius Historicus et Apologeticus de Luthernismo sive de reformatione religionis ductu D. Martini Lutheri* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1688), no pag. The quote is on the sixth page of the *Praeloquium*: ‘memini etiam tale aliquid in *Actis Eruditorum Lipsiensibus 1684. p. 383. ex Historia Anglica a D. Burneto edita annotatum legi.*’

¹³⁵³ Melchior Mittelholzer (trans.), *Historia Reformationis Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Geneva, 1686).

¹³⁵⁴ Burnet’s influence may have been considerable. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski has traced the origins of the phrase “Great Schism” as a label for the schism of 1378 to the French bishop and historian Louis Ellies Dupin. Burnet used similar wording in the *History*, describing the western church as ‘broken by a long and great Schism’ in 1378. Later in the *History*, he wrote of ‘the great Schism between the Popes of Rome and Avignon’. See Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Poets, Saints, and Visionaries of the Great Schism, 1378 – 1417* (The Pennsylvania State University Press,

came to conceptualize sixteenth-century ecclesiastical history as *the* Reformation. That conceptualization has a history that needs to be studied.

What if we today described Tudor ecclesiastical history as its seventeenth-century critics did—as the ‘first reformation’ rather than the English Reformation? Such a label would import and render normative the theological assumptions of those who desired to take mid-sixteenth century religious change in either a Presbyterian or an Independent direction. If either of these groups had won the contests of the 1640s and 1650s, then the ‘first reformation’ would have been followed by a ‘second reformation’ that accorded with the victor’s confessional and political standards. By calling mid-sixteenth century religious history the English Reformation, we instead import and render normative those seventeenth-century Anglican apologetics that sought to prevent any such change from happening. When Charles II returned to England, his restoration set the parameters for the political and religious settlement that then followed. The history of the English Reformation is therefore not about the influence of Martin Luther upon subsequent English religious history, but about a bitter seventeenth-century battle for hearts, minds, and cultural memory.

2006), p. 2; Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Part I (London, 1679), Book II, p. 109; idem., *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Part II (London, 1681), Book II, p. 290.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

CWE – Erasmus of Rotterdam. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, ed. and trans. various (University of Toronto Press, 1974 –).

DEC – Norman P. Tanner, S. J. (ed.). *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Two Volumes (Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990).

FLE – Richard Hooker. *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, ed. W. Speed Hill, Seven Volumes (1 – 5, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977 – 90; 6 – 7, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1993 – 98).

LW – Martin Luther. *Luther's Works*, ed. and trans. various (Concordia Publishing and Augsburg Fortress Press, 1958 –)

Sent. – Peter Lombard. *The Sentences*, Four Volumes, trans. Giulio Silano (Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies, 2007 – 2010).

ST – St. Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae*, Sixty-One Volumes, trans. The English Province of the Order of Preachers (Cambridge University Press, 1964 – 1981).

Film

Elizabeth, Directed by Shekhar Kapur (Universal Studios, 1998).

Printed Sources

A. M., *A Short View and Defence of the Reformation of the Church of England by King Edward and Q. Elizabeth* (London, 1654).

Abbot, George. *A treatise of the perpetuall visibilitie, and succession of the true church in all ages* (London, 1624; STC 40).

Alford, Stephen. *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Amos, Andrew. *Observations on the Statutes of the Reformation Parliament in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth* (Cambridge University Press, 1859).

Anonymous. *The Dyke of Saxonie His Ivbiee* (London, 1618; STC 14656).

Anonymous. *The Beast is Wounded* (Amsterdam, 1638; STC 22032.5).

Anonymous. *The First and Large Petition of the Citie of London* (London, 1641).

- Anonymous. *An Apology for Bishops* (London, 1641).
- Anonymous. *A Briefe Discoverse, Declaring the Impiety and Unlawfulnesse of the Covenant with the Scots* (London, 1643).
- Anonymous. *The Iniquity of the Late Solemn League* (London, 1643).
- Anonymous. *Women Will Have Their Will, Or Give Christmas His Due* (London, 1649).
- Anonymous. *Newes from Powles, Or the New Reformation of the Army* (London, 1649).
- Anonymous. *A Solemn Exhortation* (London, 1649).
- Anonymous. *Lillyes Lamentations* (London, 1652).
- Anonymous. *A Brief View and Defence of the Reformation of the Church of England by King Edward and Q. Elizabeth* (London, 1654).
- Anonymous. *Reformation Or, The Progress thereof in Some Foot-steps of it in The Congregational way of Churches in England, From the Year of our Lord, 1640* (London, 1659).
- Anonymous. *Certain Scruples and Doubts of Conscience about Taking the Solemne League and Covenant* (London, 1660).
- Anonymous. *A Door of Hope* (London, 1660).
- Anonymous. *Protestant Unity* (London, n.d.).
- Anonymous. *Semper Eadem: Or a Reference of the Debate at the Savoy 1661 to the Conference at Hampton-Court 1603/4* (London, 1662).
- Anonymous. *A True-Protestant-Catechism* (London, 1683).
- Anonymous. *The Dying Speeches of Several Excellent Persons* (London, 1689).
- Anonymous [William Whittingham?]. *A Brieff Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Frankford* (Heidelberg[?], 1574; STC 25442).
- Anonymous and John Gauden. *Certain Scruples and Doubts of Conscience* (London, 1660).
- Appleby, David J. *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester University Press, 2007).

- Aquinas, Thomas. *De regimine principum*, in *Aquinas: Political Writings*, ed. by R. W. Dyson (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Arand, Charles P., Robert Kolb, and James A. Nestingen, *The Lutheran Confessions: History and Theology of the Book of Concord* (Fortress Press, 2012).
- Arminius, Jacob. *The Works of James Arminius*, Three Volumes, ed. by James Nichols and William Nichols (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1825; reprinted with corrected pagination by Beacon Hill Press, 1986).
- Armitage, David. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Assheton, William. *The Royal Pardon* (London, 1684).
- Austin, J. L.. *How to Do Things with Words*, second ed., ed. by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (Harvard University Press, 1975).
- Bagchi, David V. N. *Luther's Earliest Opponents: Catholic Controversialists 1518 – 1525* (Augsburg Fortress, 1991).
- Bagchi, David and David Steinmetz (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Baker, Keith Michael. *Inventing the French Revolution* (Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Bancroft, Richard. *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* (London, 1593; STC 1344).
- . *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* (London, 1640; STC 1345).
- Baret, John. *An Alvearie or Triple Dictionarie* (London, 1574; STC 1410).
- Barlow, William. *The Symme and Substance of the Conference* (London, 1604; STC 1456.5).
- Bately, Janet. 'Cawdrey, Robert (b. 1537/8?, d. in or after 1604)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/69578>, accessed 27 June 2014].
- Baxter, Richard. *The Grand Debate Between the most Reverend the Bishops, and the Presbyterian Divines* (London, 1661).
- . *Full and Easy Satisfaction* (London, 1674).
- Beer, Barrett L. *Rebellion & Riot: Popular Disorder in England during the Reign of Edward VI*, rev. ed. (The Kent State University Press, 2005).

- Bellitto, Christopher M. *Nicolas de Clamanges: Spirituality, Personal Reform, and Pastoral Renewal on the Eve of the Reformation* (The Catholic University of America Press, 2001).
- Bernard, Richard. *Looke beyond Luther* (London, 1623; STC 1956.7).
- Betteridge, Thomas. *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530 – 83* (Ashgate, 1999).
- Beza, Theodore. *Novum Testamentum* (Henricus Stephanus, 1565).
- . *A Confession of Faith* (London, 1571; STC 23555).
- Bierma Lyle D. (ed.). *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism* (Baker Academic, 2005).
- Bietenholz, Peter G. *Historia and Fabula: Myths and Legends in History Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age* (Brill, 1994).
- Black, A. J. *Monarchy and Community: Political Ideas in the Later Conciliar Controversy 1430 – 1450* (Cambridge University Press, 1970).
- Black, Robert. ‘The Donation of Constantine: A New Source for the Concept of the Renaissance?’, in Alison Brown (ed.), *Language and Images of Renaissance Italy* (Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 51 – 85.
- Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Renate. *Poets, Saints, and Visionaries of the Great Schism, 1378 – 1417* (The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006).
- The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy Wengert (Fortress Press, 2000).
- Boughen, Edward. *An Account of the Church Catholick* (London, 1653)
- Braddick, Michael. *God’s Fury, England’s Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (Penguin Books, 2008).
- Bradstock, Andrew. *Radical Religion in Cromwell’s England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth* (I. B. Tauris, 2011).
- Brady, Thomas. *German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400 – 1650* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Bray, Gerald (ed.). *Tudor Church Reform: The Henrician Canons of 1535 and the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (The Boydell Press & Church of England Record Society, 2000).
- Brecht, Martin and Hermann Ehmer (eds.). *Confessio Virtembergica: Das Württembergische Bekenntnis 1552* (Häussler, 1999).

- Brigden, Susan. *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors, 1485 – 1603* (Penguin Books, 2000).
- Brooke, Christopher. ‘Cambridge in the Age of the Puritan Revolution’, in Victor Morgan, with Christopher Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge, Vol. II: 1546 – 1750* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 464 – 482.
- Browne, Robert. ‘A Treatise of Reformation without Taryng for Anie’, in idem., *A Booke with Sheweth the Life and Manners of all True Christians* (Middelburgh, 1582; STC 3910.3).
- Brydon, Michael. *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses 1600 – 1714* (Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Burnet, Gilbert. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Part I (London, 1679).
- . *A Sermon Preached before the Aldermen of the City of London* (London, 1680).
- . *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1681).
- . *An Exhortation to Peace and Union* (London, 1681).
- . *The Protestant’s Companion* (London, 1685).
- Burns, J. H. *Lordship, Kingship and Empire: The Idea of Monarchy 1400 – 1525* (Clarendon Press Oxford, 1992).
- Burton, Henry. *A Tryall of Private Devotions* (London, 1628; STC 4157).
- Calamy, Edmund. *An Abridgment of Mr. Baxter’s History*, Two Volumes (London, 1713).
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Two Volumes, trans. John T. McNeill, (Westminster John Knox Press, 1960).
- Campbell, Gordon. *Bible: The Story of the King James Bible* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Camporeale, Salvatore I. ‘Lorenzo Valla’s “Oratio” on the Pseudo-Donation of Constantine: Dissent and Innovation in Early Renaissance Humanism’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 57, no. 1 (Jan., 1996), pp. 9 - 26.
- Carleton, Dudley. *The Speech of Sir Dvdly Carlton* (London, 1618; STC 4629).
- Carleton, George. *An Examination of...the Doctrines of the Church of England* (London, 1626; STC 4634).
- Caxton, William. *Polychronicon* (Westminster, 1482; STC 13438).

Cawdry, Robert. *A Table Alphabeticall* (London, 1609; STC 4884.5).

Charles I. 'A Proclamation for the establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England' (London, 1626; STC 8824).

---. *A True Copy of His Maiesties Letter* (London, 1642).

---. *Proclamation Forbidding the Tendering or Taking of a Late Covenant, Called, A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation* (Oxford, 1643).

---. *His Majesties Declaration in Defence of the True Protestant Religion* (Oxford and London, 1643).

---. *Eikon Basilike*, ed. Jim Daems and Holly Faith Nelson (Broadview Editions, 2006).

Charles II. *Declaration* (Edinburgh, 1660).

---. *A Collection of His Majestie's Gracious Letters, Speeches, Messages, and Declarations since April 4/14 1660* (London).

---. *A Proclamation, Prohibiting all unlawful and Seditious Meetings and Conventicles under pretence of Religious Worship* (London, 1660).

---. 'A Proclamation for Authorizing an uniformity of the Book of *Common-Prayer*, to be used throughout the REALM' (London, 1660).

The Church of England. *Articles Devised by the Kynges Highnes Maiestie* (1536; STC 10033.6).

---. *Orarium* (London, 1546; STC 16042)

---. *Articles* (London, 1553; STC 10034).

---. *The Primer* (London, 1559; STC 16087).

---. *Orarium* (London, 1560; STC 16089).

---. *Preces Privatae* (London, 1564; STC 20378).

---. *The Book of Common Prayer* (1559), ed. by John E. Booty (University of Virginia Press, 2005).

---. *Constitvtions and Canons Ecclesiastical* (London, 1604; STC 10070).

---. *The Book of Common Prayer* (1662) (Everyman's Library, 1999).

- The Church of Ireland. *Constitvtions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (Dvblin, 1635; STC 14265).
- The Church of Scotland. *Canons and Constitvtions Ecclesiasticall* (Aberdeen, 1636; STC 22055).
- The Church of Scotland. *The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1638; STC 22026.8).
- The Church of Scotland. *The Booke of Common Prayer* (Edinburgh, 1637; STC 16606).
- Cicill, Edward. *A Speech Made in the Lower Hovse of Parliament* (London, 1621; STC 22087).
- Cogswell, Thomas, Richard Cust and Peter Lake, 'Revisionism and its legacies: the work of Conrad Russell', in Thomas Cogswell, et. al., *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Early Stuart Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 1 – 17.
- Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*, rev. and expanded ed. (Oxford University Press, 1970).
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707 – 1837*, third ed. (Yale University Press, 2009).
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559 – 1625* (Oxford University Press, 1982).
- . 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference', in Howard Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War: Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government* (Macmillan Press, 1983).
- . 'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I', in *Elizabethan Essays* (The Hambledon Press, 1994), pp. 87 – 118.
- . 'Elizabeth I (1533–1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2012
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/8636>, accessed 6 Feb 2016].
- . 'Field, John (1544/5?–1588)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/9248>, accessed 15 Jan 2014].
- Cooper, Thomas. *Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae* (London, 1565; STC 5686).
- Cosin, John. *A Collection of Private Devotions*, ed. P. G. Stanwood with Daniel O'Connor (Oxford University Press, 1967).

- Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (London, 1611; STC 5830).
- Coward, Barry. *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Craig, John. 'The Growth of English Puritanism', in John Coffey and Paul C. H. Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 34 – 47.
- Cranmer, Thomas. *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, Two Volumes, ed. by John Edmund Cox (The Parker Society/Cambridge University Press, 1846; reprinted by Regent College Publishing, n.d.).
- Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford University Press, 1997).
- Crofton, Zachary. *ANAAHPIS* (London, 1660).
- . *Reformation not Separation* (London, 1662).
- Crofton, Zachariah and Giles Firmin. *The Liturgical Considerator Considered* (London, 1661).
- Cromwell, Oliver. *The Government of the Common-Wealth* (London, 1654).
- Cross, F. L. and E. A. Livingstone (eds.). *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, third ed. (revised) (Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Cunningham, Alexander. *An Essay Concerning Church Government* (London, 1689).
- . *The Divine Right of Episcopacy* (London, 1690).
- Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Life* (Pearson, 2005).
- Daston, Lorraine and Katharine Park. *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150 – 1750* (Zone Books, 1998).
- Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625 – 1641* (Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Dawson, Jane. *John Knox* (Yale University Press, 2015).
- Michiel Decaluwe. *A Successful Defeat: Eugene IV's Struggle with the Council of Basel for Ultimate Authority I the Church, 1431 – 1449* (Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 2009).
- Dickens, A. G. and John M. Tonkin, with Kenneth Powell. *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Harvard University Press, 1985).
- Dixon, Leif. *Practical Predestinarians in England, c. 1590 – 1640* (Ashgate, 2014).

- Dixon, C. Scott. *Contesting the Reformation* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).
- Dodds, Gregory D. *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (University of Toronto Press, 2009).
- Donne, John. *Pseudo-martyr* (London, 1610; STC 7048).
- Downname, George. *A treatise concerning Antichrist* (London, 1603; STC 7120).
- Downing, Calybutte. *Considerations Toward a Peaceable Reformation in Matters Ecclesiasticall* (London, 1641).
- Dudley, John. *The Sayinge of John late Duke of Northumberlande uppon the scaffold, at the tyme of his execution* (London, 1553; STC 7283).
- Duffy, Eamon. *Saints & Sinners: A History of the Popes*, second ed. (Yale, 2001).
- . *The Stripping of the Altars*, second ed. (Yale University Press, 2005).
- . *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (Yale University Press, 2009).
- Dury, John. *Good Counsellis for the Peace of Reformed Churches* (London, 1641).
- Edward VI. *Iniunccions geven by the moste excellente Prince, Edwarde the sixte* (London, 1547; STC 10089).
- . *A Message Sent by the Kynges Maiestie, to Certain of His People, Assembled in Devonshire* (London, 1549; STC 7506).
- Elizabeth I. *Iniunctions* (London, 1559; STC 10099.5).
- Elyot, Thomas. *The Dictionary* (London, 1538; STC 7659).
- Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam. *The First Tome or Volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the Newe Testament*, trans. Nicholas Udall (London, 1548; STC 2854.3).
- Estes, James M. *Christian Magistrate and Territorial Church* (Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007).
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 2 (Harvard University Press, 1932).
- Fairfield, Leslie P. *John Bale: Mythmaker of the English Reformation* (Purdue University Press, 1976; reprinted by Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006).
- Featley, Daniel. *The Fisher Caught in his Owne Net* (London, 1623; STC 10732).

- . *The Romish Fisher Cavght and Held in his Owne Net* (London, 1624; STC 10738.3).
- . *Pelagius Redivivus* (London, 1626; STC 10736).
- . *The League Illegal* (London, 1660).
- Ferne, Henry. *The Unlawfullnesse of the New Covenant* (Oxford, 1643).
- . *Of the Division Between the English and Romish Church upon the Reformation* (London, 1652).
- . *Of the Division Between the English and Romish Church upon the Reformation* (London, 1655).
- Field, John and Thomas Wilcox, et. al. *An Admonition to the Parliament* (Leiden[?], 1617; STC 10849).
- Fincham, Kenneth (ed.). *The Early Stuart Church, 1603 – 1642* (Stanford University Press, 1993).
- Fincham, Kenneth. 'The Restoration of Altars in the 1630s', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Dec., 2001), pp. 919 – 940.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake. 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Apr. 1985), pp. 169-207.
- Fisher, John. *The sermon....made agayn ye p[er]nicious doctryn of Martin luther* (London, 1521; STC 10894).
- Fletcher, Anthony and Diarmaid MacCulloch. *Tudor Rebellions*, sixth ed. (Routledge, 2016).
- Ford, Thomas. *Reformation Sure and Stedfast* (London, 1641).
- Foster, Andrew. 'Durham House group (act. 1617–1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/72182>, accessed 4 July 2014].
- Fox, George. *Caesar's Due* (London, 1679).
- Foxe, John. *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 02.06.2016.].
- . *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1641).

- . *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (London, 1641)
- Freeman, Thomas S. ‘‘The Reformation of the Church in this Parliament’’: Thomas Norton, John Foxe and the Parliament of 1571’, *Parliamentary History*, vol. 16, pt. 2 (1997), pp. 131 – 47.
- . ‘Foxe, John (1516/17–1587)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/2048/view/article/10050>, accessed 15 Jan 2014].
- Fudge, Thomas A. *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Ashgate, 1998).
- (trans. and ed.). *The Crusade against the Heretics in Bohemia, 1418 – 1437* (Ashgate, 2002).
- Fuller, Thomas. *The Church-History of Britain* (London, 1655).
- Gauden, John. *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspira* (London, 1659).
- . *ΑΝΑΛΥΣΙΣ. The Loosing of St. Peters Bands* (London, 1660).
- . *A Pillar of Gratitude* (London, 1660).
- . *Considerations Touching the Liturgy* (London, 1661).
- The Geneva Bible, ed. William Whittingham (Geneva, 1560; STC 2093).
- Gehring, David Scott. *Anglo-German Relations and the Protestant Cause: A Study of Elizabethan Foreign Policy and Pan-Protestantism* (Pickering and Chatto, 2013).
- . ‘From the Strange Death to the Odd Afterlife of Lutheran England’, *The Historical Journal*, vol. 57, issue 3, September 2014, pp. 825 – 844.
- Gerhard, Johan. *The Conqvst of Temptations* (London, 1614; STC 11767.5).
- Gibson, Kenneth. ‘Burton, Henry (bap. 1578, d. 1647/8)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4129>, accessed 3 Dec 2014]
- Gough, William. *Londinum Triumphans* (London, 1682).
- Gordon, Bruce. *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Greschat, Martin. *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and his Times*, trans. Stephen E. Buckwalter (Westminster John Knox Press, 2004).

- Greig, Martin. 'Burnet, Gilbert (1643–1715)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2013
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/4061>, accessed 17 Jan 2016].
- Grimston, Harbottle. *Master Grimston his worthy and learned speech* (London, 1641).
- Gootjes, Nicolaas H. *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources* (Baker Academic, 2007).
- Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660 – 1663* (Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Gunter, Stephen. *Arminius and His Declaration of Sentiments: An Annotated Translation with Introduction and Theological Commentary* (Baylor University Press, 2012).
- H. S. *Reasons Shewing that There is No Need of Such a Reformation* (London, 1660).
- Haigh, Christopher. Review of *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590 – 1640*, *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 103, No. 407 (Apr., 1988), pp. 425 – 7.
- . *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Hall, John. *An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England Concerning the Advancement of Learning: And Reformation of the Universities* (London, 1649).
- Hall, Joseph. *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament* (London, 1641).
- . *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance* (London, 1641).
- . *A Letter Sent to an Honourable Gentleman* (London, 1641).
- Hardwick, Charles. *A History of the Articles of Religion: To which is Added a Series of Documents from A. D. 1536 to A.D. 1615, Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources* (Deighton, Bell and Co., 1859).
- Hartley, T. E. (ed.). *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I*, Vol. 1: 1558 – 1581 (Leicester University Press, 1981).
- Harvey, Margaret. *England, Rome and the Papacy 1417 – 1464: The Study of a Relationship* (Manchester University Press, 1993).
- . 'England, the Council of Florence and the end of the Council of Basel', in Giuseppe Alberigo (ed.), *Christian Unity: The Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438/39 – 1989* (Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 203 – 225.

- Haugaard, William P. *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 1968).
- Hayward, John. *The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixth*, ed. by Barrett L. Beer (The Kent State University Press, 1993).
- . *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by John Bruce (The Camden Society, 1840).
- Robert M. Healey. 'John Knox's "History": A "Compleat" Sermon on Christian Duty', *Church History*, Vol. 61, No. 3 (Sept., 1992), pp. 319 - 333.
- Hefling, Charles. 'The State Services', in Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds.), *The Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 73 – 5.
- Henderson, Alexander. *The Protestation* (Edinburgh, 1638; STC 21904).
- . *The Covenant* (London, 1643).
- Henry VIII. *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* (London, 1522; STC 13079).
- . *An Epistle* (London, 1537; STC 13081).
- Heylyn, Peter. *A Briefe and Moderate Answer* (London, 1637; STC 13269).
- . *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Syfferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate The L. Archbishop of Canterbvry* (London, 1644).
- . *The Way of Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified* (London, 1653).
- . *The Way and Manner of the Reformation of the Church of England Declared and Justified* (London, 1657).
- . *Cyprianvs Anglicvs* (London, 1668).
- . *Ecclesia Restaurata* (London, 1674).
- Higgins, John (ed.). *Huloets Dictionarie* (London, 1572; STC 13941).
- Highley, Christopher. "'A Pestilent and Seditious Book': Nicholas Sander's *Schismatis Anglicani* and Catholic Histories of the Reformation'. *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 68, nos. 1 & 2 (2005), pp. 151 – 71.
- Hooker, Richard. *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie; The Sixth and Eighth Books* (London, 1648).

- Horie, Hirofumi. 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement, 1558 – 1563', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 34, no. 3 (Sep., 1991), pp. 519 – 37.
- Hyland, William Patrick. 'Reform Preaching and Despair at the Council of Pavia-Siena (1423 – 1424)', *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 84, no. 3 (Jul., 1998), pp. 409 – 430.
- Huggarde, Miles. *The Displaying of the Protestantes* (London, 1556; STC 13558).
- Huloet, Richard. *Abcedarium Anglico Latinum* (London, 1552; STC 13940).
- Hutton, Ronald. *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Clarendon Press, 1989).
- Innocent III. *Between God and Man: Six Sermons on the Priesthood*, trans. Corrine J. Vause and Frank C. Gardiner (The Catholic University of America Press, 2004).
- Israel, Jonathan I. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477 – 1806* (Oxford University Press, 1995).
- James I. *A Declaration Made by King James, in Scotland; Concerning Church-Government, and Presbyters* (London, 1646).
- James I and Andrew Willett. *King Iames his Iudgement by Way of Counsell and Advice* (London, 1642).
- James I and Anonymous. *A Puritane Set Forth in his Lively Colours* (London, 1642).
- James I and Anonymous. *King Iames his Iudgement of a King and of a Tyrant* (London, 1642).
- James I and Anonymous. *King James his Opinion and Iudgement, Concerning a Reall King and a Tyrant* (London, 1647).
- James VI and I. *Basilicon Doron*, in Johann P. Sommerville (ed.), *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Jeanes, Gordon P. *Signs of God's Promise: Thomas Cranmer's Sacramental Theology and the Book of Common Prayer* (T & T Clark, 2008).
- Jones, Norman L. 'An Elizabethan Bill for the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Law', *Parliamentary History*, vol. 4 (1985), pp. 171 – 87.
- Josephus. *The Jewish War*, trans. H. ST. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library 210 (Harvard University Press, 1928).
- Keeble, N. H. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Blackwell Publishing, 2002).

- Kempe, Margery. *The Book of Margery Kempe*, trans. Anthony Bale (Oxford University Press, 2015).
- à Kempis, Thomas. *The Imitation of Christ*, introduced by Max von Habsburg and translated by Robert Jeffery (Penguin Books, 2013).
- . *A ful deuout and gostely treatyse of the imitacyon and folowyng the blessed lyfe of our moste mercyful sauour cryste*, trans. by William Atkinson and Margaret Beaufort (London, 1504; STC 23954.7).
- . *Here after foloweth the fourth boke, of the folowyng of Chryste*, trans. Richard Whitford (London, 1531; STC 23962).
- . *Soliloquium animae*, trans. and corrected by Thomas Rogers (London, 1592; STC 23995).
- Kendall, R. T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*, second ed. (Paternoster, 1997).
- Kenyon, J. P. (ed.). *The Stuart Constitution 1603 – 1688: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge University Press, 1969).
- . *The Popish Plot* (St. Martin's Press, 1972; reprinted by Phoenix Press, 2000).
- . 'Revisionism and Post-Revisionism in Early Stuart History', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 64, no. 4 (Dec., 1992), pp. 686 – 699.
- Kess, Alexandra. *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History* (Ashgate, 2008).
- Kesselring, K.J. *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
- Joseph Ketley (ed.). *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552* (The Parker Society/Cambridge University Press, 1844; reprinted by Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006).
- Kim, Joong-Lak. 'The Scottish-English-Romish Book: the character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637', in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 15 – 32.
- King, Henry. *An Elegy Upon the most Incomparable K. Charls the I* (London, n.d.)
- King, John N. 'Religious Writing', in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature: 1500 – 1660* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 104 – 31.
- Kirby, W. J. Torrance. *Richard Hooker, Reformer and Platonist* (Ashgate, 2005).
- Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (Penguin Books, 1996).

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645 – 1661* (Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Knox, John. *The Historie of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1644).

---. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland*, Two Volumes, ed. William Croft Dickinson (Philosophical Library, 1950).

---. *Knox: On Rebellion*, ed. Roger A. Mason (Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Kolb, Robert. *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520 – 1620* (Baker Academic, 1999).

Koller, Heinrich (ed.). *Reformation Kaiser Siegmunds* (Stuttgart, 1964).

Kouri, E. I. *England and the Attempts to form a Protestant Alliance in the Late 1560s: A Case in European Diplomacy* (Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1981).

---. *Elizabethan England and Europe: Forty Unprinted Letters from Elizabeth I to Protestant Powers* (Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 1982).

de Kroon, Marijn. *We Believe in God and in Christ: The Influence of Wessel Gansfort on Martin Bucer*, trans. Maria Sherwood Smith (Westminster John Knox Press, 2009).

L'Estrange, Roger. *The Reformed Catholique: Or, The True Protestant* (London, 1679).

Lacey, Andrew. *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Boydell, 2003).

Ladner, Gerhart B. *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Harvard University Press, 1959).

Laeven, Augustinus Hubertus. *The "Acta eruditorum" under the Editorship of Otto Mencke (1644-1707): The history of an International Learned Journal between 1682 and 1707*, trans. Lynne Richards (APA-Holland University Press, 1990).

Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge University Press, 1982).

---. 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I', in Linda Levy Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 113 – 33.

---. 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603 – 1642* (Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 161 – 85.

- Leppin, Volker. 'Luther's Transformation of Medieval Thought', in Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel, and L'ubomír Batka (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology* (Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 115 – 26.
- Leslie, Henry. *The Martyrdome of King Charles* (The Hague and London, 1649)
- Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).
- Loach, Jennifer. *Edward VI*, ed. George Bernard and Penry Williams (Yale University Press, 1999).
- . 'The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', *Past & Present*, no. 142 (Feb., 1994), pp. 43 – 68.
- Loades, David. *Elizabeth I* (Hambledon Continuum, 2003).
- . *Henry VIII: Court, Church and Conflict* (The National Archives, 2007).
- . 'Dudley, John, duke of Northumberland (1504–1553)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/8156>, accessed 4 Dec 2014].
- Logan, F. Donald. 'The Henrician Canons', *The Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 47, no. 1 (1974), pp. 99 – 103.
- Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, vol. 50 (Weimar, 1914).
- Maltby, Judith. *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998).
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Thomas Cranmer* (Yale University Press, 1996).
- . *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (University of California Press, 1999).
- . *The Later Reformation in England, 1547 – 1603*, second ed. (Palgrave, 2001).
- . *The Reformation* (Viking, 2004).
- Mann, Jesse D. 'The Devilish Pope: Eugenius IV as Lucifer in the Later Works of Juan de Segovia', *Church History*, vol. 65, no. 2 (Jun., 1996), pp. 184 – 96.
- Manning, John J. 'Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/12794>, accessed 27 June 2014].

Mansfield, Bruce. *Phoenix of His Age: Interpretations of Erasmus c 1550 – 1750* (University of Toronto Press, 1979).

Peter Marshall, '(Re)defining the English Reformation', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (July 2009), pp. 564 – 586.

---. 'The Naming of Protestant England', *Past and Present* no. 214 (February 2012), pp. 87 – 128.

Marshall, Stephen. *Reformation and Desolation* (London, 1642).

Mason, A. J. *Bishop Guest: Articles Twenty-Eight and Twenty-Nine* (Rivington, Percival & Co., 1894).

Mayer, T. F. 'Sander, Nicholas (c.1530–1581)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2014
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/24621>, accessed 4 Dec 2014].

Mayes, Benjamin T. G. *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning After the Reformation* (Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

McCafferty, John. *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633 – 1641* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).

McDermott, Peter L. 'Nicholas of Cusa: Continuity and Conciliation at the Council of Basel', *Church History*, vol. 67, no. 2 (Jun., 1998), pp. 254 – 273.

McEntegart, Rory. *Henry VIII, The League of Schmalkalden, and the English Reformation* (The Boydell Press, 2002).

McGrath, Alister. *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture* (Anchor Books, 2001).

---. *The Intellectual origins of the European Reformation*, second ed. (Blackwell Publishing, 2004).

---. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, third ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2005)

McGuire, Brian Patrick. *Jean Gerson and the Last Medieval Reformation* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005).

- MacKenzie, Iain M. *God's Order and Natural Law: The works of the Laudian Divines* (Ashgate, 2002).
- McKim, Donald K. (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Martin Luther* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Melanchthon, Philip. *The Chief Theological Topics: Loci Praecipui Theologici 1559*, trans. J. A. O. Preus, second ed. (Concordia Publishing House, 2011).
- Milton Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600 – 1640* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- (ed.). *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618 – 1619)* (Boydell, 2005).
- . 'The creation of Laudianism: a new approach', in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 162 – 184.
- . *Laudian and royalist polemic in seventeenth-century England* (Manchester University Press, 2007).
- Milton, John. *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus* (London, 1641).
- . *Of Reformation* (London, 1641).
- . *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (London, 1649).
- Minnich, Nelson H. *The Fifth Lateran Council (1512 – 1517)* (Variorum, 1993).
- Mittarelli, D. Joannis-Benedicti and D. Anselmi Constadoni (eds.). *Annales Camaldulenses Ordines Sancti Benedicti*, Tomus Nonus (Venice, 1773).
- Mittelholzer, Melchior (trans.). *Historia Reformationis Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Geneva, 1686).
- Montagu, Richard. *A Gagg for the New Gospel?* (London, 1624; STC 18038).
- Du Moulin, Pierre. *The Anatomy of Arminianism* (London, 1620; STC 7308).
- Moulin, Peter and Lancelot Andrewes. *Of Episcopacy* (London, 1647).
- Mullan, David George. 'Cowper, William (1568–1619)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6509>, accessed 6 July 2014].

- Muller, Richard. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Baker Academic, 2008).
- . *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, Four Volumes (Baker Academic, 2003).
- . 'Demoting Calvin: The Issue of Calvin and the Reformed Tradition', in Amy Nelson Burnett (ed.), *John Calvin, Myth and Reality: Images and Impact of Geneva's Reformer* (Cascade Books, 2011), pp. 3 – 17.
- Nenner, Howard. 'Regicides (act. 1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/70599>, accessed 6 Dec 2014].
- Nicholas of Cusa. *The Catholic Concordance*, trans. and ed. Paul E. Sigmund (Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- . *Writings on Church and Reform*, trans. Thomas M. Izbicki (Harvard University Press, 2008).
- Nye, Philip. *Beames of Former Light* (London, 1660).
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The Debate on the English Reformation* (Routledge, 1986).
- O'Malley, John W. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Harvard University Press, 2000).
- . *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013).
- Oakley, Francis. *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300 – 1870* (Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Oates, Titus. *The Discovery of the Popish Plot* (London, 1679).
- Oberman, Heiko. *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (Yale University Press, 1989).
- Ockham, William. *Predestination, God's Foreknowledge, and Future Contingents*, trans. and ed. by Marilyn McCord Adams and Norman Kretzmann, second edition (Hackett Publishing Company, 1983).
- Olin, John C. *Catholic Reform: From Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent 1495 – 1563* (Fordham University Press, 1990).
- Oxford English Dictionary (third edition, 2012).

- Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250 – 1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (Yale University Press, 1980)
- Paravicini-Bagliani, Agostino. *The Pope's Body*, trans. David S. Peterson (The University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- The Parliament of England and Wales. *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons...For the Calling of an Assembly of Learned, and Godly Divines* (London, 1643).
- The Parliament of England and Wales. *An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. For the Visitation and Reformation of the University of Oxford and the Severall Colledges and Halls therein* (London, 1647).
- . *The Humble Petition and Advice* (London, 1657).
- Parry, Graham. *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud and Honour* (Boydell, 2006).
- Patterson, W. B. 'The Anglican Reaction', in Lewis W. Spitz and Wenzel Lohff (eds.), *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord: Studies in the Lutheran Reformation's Dialogue of Concord* (Fortress Press, 1977), pp. 150 – 65.
- . *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- . *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England* (Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Spirit Versus Structure: Luther and the Institutions of the Church* (Collins, 1968).
- Pemble, William. *Vindiciae Gratiae* (London, 1627; STC 19591).
- Perkins, William. *A Reformed Catholike* (London, 1598; STC 19736).
- Philalathes, Salem. *The Moderate Independent Proposing a Word in Season to the Gathered Churches* (London, 1660).
- Piccolomini, Aeneas Sylvius. *De Gestis Concilii Basiliensis Commentariorum Libri II*, ed. and trans. Denys Hay and W. K. Smith, rev. ed. (Oxford University Press, 1967).
- Ponet, John. *A Short Catechism* (London, 1553; STC 4812).
- . *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Pouuer* (1556; STC 20178).
- . *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Power* (London, 1639; STC 20179).

- . *A Short Treatise of Politique Povver* (London, 1642).
- Pragman, James H. 'The Augsburg Confession in the English Reformation: Richard Taverner's Contribution', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 75 – 85.
- Poore Pratt. *The Copie of a Pistel or Letter* (London, 1553; STC 20188).
- Prynne, William. *A Briefe Svrvey and Censvre of Mr Cozens His Couzening Deuotions* (London, 1628; STC 20455a).
- . *The Chvrch of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme* (London, 1629; STC 20457).
- . *Anti-Arminianism* (London, 1630; STC 20458).
- Pucci, Michael S. 'Reforming Roman Emperors: John Foxe's Characterization of Constantine in the *Acts and Monuments*', in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Ashgate, 1999), pp. 29 – 51.
- Redworth, Glyn. *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (Yale University Press, 2003).
- Resbury, Richard. *The Tabernacle of God with Men: Or, the Visible Church Reformed* (London, 1649).
- Rex, Richard. *The Lollards* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
- Rider, John. *A Friendly Caveat to Irelands Catholikes* (Dublin, 1602; STC 21031).
- Rider, John and Francis Holyoake. *Riders Dictionarie Corrected* (London, 1612; STC 21033).
- Robinson, Hastings (ed.). *The Zurich Letters* (Cambridge University Press, 1842).
- . *The Zurich Letters (Second Series)* (Cambridge University Press, 1845).
- . *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation (The First Portion)* (Cambridge University Press, 1846).
- . *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation (The Second Portion)* (Cambridge University Press, 1847).
- Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660 – 1688* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Rosemond, Jean-Baptiste de (trans.). *Histoire de la Reformation de l'Eglise d'Angleterre* (London, 1683)

- Rowland, John. *A Reply to the Answer of Anonymus* (London, 1660).
- Ryrie, Alec. 'The Strange Death of Lutheran England'. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 53, no. 1 (January, 2002), pp. 64 – 92.
- . *The origins of the Scottish Reformation* (Manchester University Press, 2006).
- . 'The Afterlife of Lutheran England', in Dorothea Wedenbourg (ed.), *Sister Reformations – Schwesterreformationen* (Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 213 – 34,
- . *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Russell, Conrad. *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637 – 1642* (Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Russell, John. *The Spy Discovering the Danger of Arminian Heresie and Spanish Trecherie* (Amsterdam, 1628; STC 20577).
- Sander, Nicholas. *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, trans. by David Lewis (Burns and Oates, 1877).
- Schaff, Philip (ed.). *The Creeds of Christendom*, Three Volumes (Harper and Row, 1931; reprinted by Baker Books, 2007).
- Schofield, A. N. E. D. 'England, the Pope, and the Council of Basel', *Church History*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (Sept., 1964), pp. 248 – 278.
- Schofield, John. *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation* (Ashgate, 2006).
- Scott, Thomas. *Vox Populi or Newes from Spayne* (London, 1620; STC 22098).
- Scribner, R. W. 'Incombustible Luther: The Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany', *Past & Present*, No. 110 (Feb., 1986), pp. 38 – 68.
- Scribner, Bob, Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich (eds.). *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Seckendorff, Veit Ludwig. *Commentarius Historicus et Apologeticus de Luthernismo sive De Reformatione Religionis Ductu D. Martini Lutheri* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1688).
- Seed, John. *Dissenting Histories: Religious Division and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England* (Edinburgh University Press, 2008).
- Shagan, Ethan H. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

- Shakespeare, William. *King Henry VIII*, ed. Gordon McMullan, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (A & C Black Publishers, 2000).
- . *Sir Thomas More*, ed. John Jowett, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (A & C Black Publishers, 2011).
- Shapin, Steven. *The Scientific Revolution* (University of Chicago Press, 1996).
- Shaw, John. *Origo Protestantium* (London, 1677).
- Shriver, Frederick. 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (January 1982).
- Shuger, Debora. 'A Protesting Catholic Puritan in Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (July 2009).
- Skinner, Quentin. *Visions of Politics*, Vol. 1: Regarding Method (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Sleidanus, Johannes. *A Famovse Cronicle of our Time* (London, 1560; STC 19848).
- Smart, Peter. *The Vantie & Downe-Fall of Svperstitiovs Popish Ceremonies* (London, 1628; STC 22640.7).
- Smectymnuus. *An Answer to a Book Entitvled An Humble Remonstrance* (London, 1641).
- . *A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance* (London, 1641).
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The Crusades: A Short History* (Yale University Press, 1987).
- Smyth, Jim. *The Making of the United Kingdom 1660 – 1800* (Longman, 2001).
- Sparrow, Anthony. *A Collection of Articles* (London, 1661).
- Spinks, Bryan D. 'Treasures Old and New: A Look at Some of Thomas Cranmer's Methods of Liturgical Compilation', in Paul Ayriss and David Selwyn (eds.), *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar* (The Boydell Press, 1993), pp. 175 – 88.
- Spurr, John. *The Post-Reformation 1603 – 1714* (Pearson Longman, 2006).
- Stanglin, Keith D. 'The New Perspective on Arminius: Notes on a Historiographical Shift', *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2009), pp. 295 – 310.
- (ed.). *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Notes* (Brill, 2010).

- Stanglin, Keith D. and Thomas H. McCall. *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Stephen, Jeffrey. *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh University Press, 2007).
- Stillingfleet, Edward. *Several Conferences Between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England* (London, 1679).
- Gerald Strauss (ed. and trans.). *Manifestations of Discontent in Germany the Eve of the Reformation* (Indiana University Press, 1971).
- Stump, Philip H. *The Reforms of the Council of Constance (1414 – 1418)* (Brill, 1994).
- . 'The Council of Constance and the End of the Schism', in Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Izbicki (eds.), *A Companion to the Great Western Schism (1378 – 1417)* (Brill, 2009), pp. 395 – 442.
- Sudbury, John. *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Revered Fathers in God* (London, 1660).
- Supreme Council of Confederate Catholics. *Admonitions by the Sypreame Covncell of the Confederat Catholicks of Ireland* (Waterford, 1643).
- Sutcliffe, Matthew. *The subuersion of Robert Parsons* (London, 1606; STC 23469).
- Tierney Brian (ed.). *The Crisis of Church and State 1050 – 1300* (University of Toronto Press and the Medieval Academy of America, 1988).
- Thomas, Thomas. *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (London, 1589; STC 24008).
- Till, Barry. 'Participants in the Savoy conference (act. 1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press.
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/theme/92781>, accessed 14 July 2015].
- Todd, Margo. "'All One with Tom Thumb': Arminianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge", *Church History*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (Dec., 1995), pp. 563 – 79.
- Toon, Peter. 'The Parker Society', *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, vol. 46, no. 3 (1977), pp. 323 – 332.
- Travers, Walter. *A Directory of Church-Government* (London, 1644).
- Trueman, Carl R. *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525 – 1556* (The Clarendon Press, 1994).

Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590 – 1640*, new ed. (Oxford University Press, 1990).

---. 'Archbishop Laud', in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603 – 1642* (Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 51 – 70.

---. *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530 – 1700* (Manchester University Press, 2001).

University of Oxford. *The Answere of...the Universitie of Oxford* (Oxford, 1603; STC 19011).

---. *The Humble Petition of the Ministers of the Church of England* (Oxford[?], 1641).

---. *Reasons of the Present Judgment of the University of Oxford* (London, 1647).

Ussher, James. *The Reduction of Episcopacie* (London, 1656).

Valla, Lorenzo. *On The Donation of Constantine*, trans. G. W. Bowersock (Harvard University Press, 2007).

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, trans. and ed. by John Patrick Donnelly, S. J. (Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1995).

---. *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, edited and translated by Frank A. James III (Truman State University Press, 2003).

Vernon, E. C. 'Crofton, Zachary (1626–1672)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu/view/article/6724>, accessed 22 July 2015].

Vidmar, John. *English Catholic Historians of the English Reformation, 1585 – 1954* (Sussex Academic Press, 2005).

von Wied, Hermann. *Einfaltigs Bedencken* (Cologne, 1543).

---. *A Simple, and Religious Consultation* (London, 1547; STC 13213).

---. *The Right Institucion of Baptisme* (London, 1548; STC 13211).

---. *The Right Instytucion of Baptisme* (London, 1549; STC 13212).

---. *A brefe and a playne declaration of the dewty of married folks* (London, 1553; STC 13208).

W. R. S. *Every-dayes Sacrifice* (London, 1624; STC 6398).

W. T. *Regulated Zeal* (London, 1641).

- Wallace, Dewey D., Jr. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525 – 1695* (North Carolina University Press, 1982).
- Ward, Richard. *The Analysis, Explication, and Application of the Sacred and Solemn League and Covenant* (London, 1643).
- Warriston, Archibald. *A Short Relation of the State of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1638; STC 22039).
- Watson, Francis J. 'Robert Vaux and Martin Chemnitz: An Anglican-Lutheran Encounter', *Anglican Theological Review*, vol. 79, no. 1 (Wint. 1997), pp. 38 – 44.
- Watson, Richard. *Regicidivm Jvdaicvm* (The Hague, 1649).
- Webb, Diana. *Pilgrimage in Medieval England* (Hambledon Continuum, 2000).
- Wedenbourg, Dorothea (ed.). *Sister Reformations – Schwesterreformationen* (Mohr Siebeck, 2010).
- Westminster Assembly. *A Solemn League and Covenant for Reformation, and Defence of Religion* (Edinburgh, 1643).
- . *A Directory for the Public Worship of God* (London, 1644).
- E. C. Whitaker. *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer* (The Alcuin Club, 1974).
- White, Peter. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Whitgift, John. *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1572; STC 25428).
- . *An Answere to a Certen Libel Intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1573; STC 25429).
- . *The Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition* (London, 1574; STC 25430.5).
- Whiting, Michael S. *Luther in English: The Influence of His Theology of Law and Gospel on Early Evangelicals (1525 – 35)* (Pickwick Publications, 2010).
- Wilkins, David. *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, Four Volumes (London, 1737).
- Willett, Andrew. *Synopsis Papismi* (London, 1592; STC 25696).
- Wilson, Thomas. *A Christian Dictionary* (London, 1612; STC 25786).

---, *A Christian Dictionary*, second edition (London, 1616; STC 25787).

Winstanley, William. *The Protestant Almanack* (London, 1684).

Woodward, Ezekias. *The Solemn League and Covenant of Three Kingdomes* (London, 1643)

Worden, Blair. 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate', in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *Persecution and Toleration* (Basil Blackwell, 1984), pp. 199 – 246.

---. 'Cromwellian Oxford', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 733 – 772.

Wotton, Anthony. *A Dangerous Plot Discovered* (London, 1626; STC 26003).

Yates, John. *Gods Arraignement of Hypocrites* (London, 1615; STC 26081).

---. *Ibis ad Caesarem* (London, 1626; STC 26083).

Young, John R. 'The Covenanters and the Scottish Parliament, 1639 – 51: The Rule of the Godly and the 'Second Scottish Reformation'', in Elizabeth Boran and Crawford Gribben (eds.), *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550 – 1700* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 131 – 158.